UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

DECOLONIZING THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE CLASSROOM: A HETEROGLOSSIA OF IDEOLOGICAL SHIFT IN INDIGENOUS LANGAUGE REVITALIZAION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

MARTYNE ELIZABETH FARRIS
Norman, Oklahoma
2017

DECOLONIZING THE INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE CLASSROOM: A HETEROGLOSSIA OF IDEOLOGICAL SHIFT IN INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE REVITALIZATION

A THESIS APPROVED FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGY

BY

Dr. Sean O'Neill, Chair

Dr. Racquel Sapien

Dr. Kimberly Marshall

Dr. Daniela Busciglio

© Copyright by MARTYNE ELIZABETH FARRIS 2017
All Rights Reserved.

Acknowledgements

I would particularly like to thank Mrs. Christine Armer, Mr. Dane Poolaw, and Mr. Kevin Roberts-Fields for their significant contributions to my thesis, both through interviews and some classroom observation. They are all dedicated and inspiring teachers, and I am privileged to have worked with them.

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of my committee. I would like to thank my chair, Dr. Sean O'Neill, for his encouragement throughout the process. His passion for linguistic anthropology continues to inspire me. I would also like to thank Dr. Raquel-María Sapién for her constant support and availability. She has been a true role model for me as I learn to become a reflexive scholar. I would like to thank Dr. Kim Marshall for encouraging me to pursue this research question. Her support through the logistical processes of this research has also been invaluable. I would also like to thank Dr. Daniela Busciglio for challenging me to think creatively about my research questions, and always providing a listening ear for my struggles though the process. She has helped me look at my research from an interdisciplinary perspective, and continues to encourage me to do my best work.

Finally, I would like to thank my husband, Shane Farris, whose tireless support and encouragement was a major factor in my ability to complete this research well. Despite working on a thesis of his own, he consistently provided motivation a sounding board for my ideas.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements iv

Abstract vi

Chapter One: Introduction 1

Chapter Two: Creating an Ideological Third Space in the University Language Classroom 5

Chapter Three: Case Studies of Ideological Hybridity 27

Chapter Four: A Heteroglossia of Ideological Shift: Implications for Indigenous Revitalization and Survivance 60

References 78

Appendix A: Interview Questions 88

Abstract

This thesis examines the language ideologies of three Native American language instructors at the University of Oklahoma, looking specifically at the way these ideologies are seen in their pedagogical methodologies. This research is interested in the way colonial education practices contributed to an ideological shift among speakers of indigenous languages and the way that shift is actualized in individual people, particularly language teachers. Rather than a simple shift from an indigenous to Euro-American language ideology as a result of colonization, there is a wide variety of ideological blending among indigenous language teachers. Understanding the multiplicity of ideologies that resulted from the clash between Euro-American and indigenous language ideologies as a heteroglossia helps to avoid essentialization of indigenous language ideologies as a homogenous whole. The complex and varried nature of this ideological heteroglossia plays an important role in indigenous decolonization and continued survivance in a neocolonial world, and as such should be supported in academic settings.

Chapter 1: Introduction

The study of language ideologies is a complex and multifaceted subfield of linguistic anthropology, one that Michael Silverstein suggests can nearly stand alone as its own field of study in “The Limits of Awareness” (1981). In the broadest sense, it encompasses not just the study of ideologies about language itself, but also the role of language in the creation and reification of all ideological positioning. It is necessary to position language at the center of all ideological creation and reproduction since “the process of understanding any ideological phenomenon at all…cannot operate without the participation of inner speech” (Voloshinov 1973, 15). For this research, however, I focus on a narrower conception of language ideology; namely, beliefs and attitudes about the nature of language itself. There are many different language ideologies in the world, each seeming self-evident to the people that hold it.

In this research, I examine the language ideologies of three different indigenous language instructors at the University of Oklahoma, looking specifically at the way these ideologies are seen in their pedagogical methodologies. Because all of the languages discussed in this thesis are endangered, my main concern is the way the complex and varied ideologies of each instructor can be supported in the university classroom in order to better support the decolonization of the university. An indigenous language class at the university level has the unique opportunity to contribute to the decolonization of a traditionally Euro-American dominated space, and language ideologies play an important role in this process. As Kroskrity and Field (2009) posit, “language ideologies are a necessary and critical part of any complete analysis of a language in a speech community" (4), and as such represent an important piece of the larger picture of indigenous survivance.

In this research, I am interested in the way colonial education practices contributed to an ideological shift among speakers of indigenous languages, and the way that shift is actualized in individual people, particularly language teachers. What I found through the process was a wide variety of ideological blending, rather than a simple shift from an indigenous to Euro-American language ideology. It is important to understand the multiplicity of ideologies that resulted from the clash between Euro-American and indigenous language ideologies as a heteroglossia, in order to avoid essentializing them into a homogenous whole. The complex and varried nature of this ideological heteroglossia plays an important role in indigenous revitalization and continued survivance in a neocolonial world, and as such should be supported in academic settings.

The data I gathered for this research is all ethnographic, consisting of lengthy interviews with three different indigenous language instructors at the University of Oklahoma. All three of them agreed to speak non-anonymously, allowing me to connect their words with the rich histories of their languages in Oklahoma. I transcribed each interview completely to allow me to quote the instructors directly and minimize my own interpretation of their words. Additionally, they were given opportunity to comment on my draft of their interview in order to ensure I had represented them well. As a non-indigenous researcher, it was important to me to minimize the opportunities for misrepresentation in this research, and to strive for complete transparency with each instructor.

There is much nuance to this kind of ethnographic inquiry, and I am aware of the limitations for this particular study, mainly the lack of multiple interviews which limited my ability to recast certain questions in order to probe more deeply at the contrasting language ideologies. I also had to constantly check my assumptions that came along with my positioning as a non-indigenous anthropologist rather than an indigenous language teacher or revitalization worker, and my biases influenced the questions I asked and the analysis I formed for the answers. I came into this project with a clear idea where it was headed, only to be almost immediately confronted with my own bias in assuming a homogenous shift among indigenous language speakers. The interview data I gathered changed the nature of my hypothesis multiple times throughout the process, which was at once an exciting and frustrating experience. In the end, I discovered that the complex hybridity of ideologies among the language instructors I interviewed point towards a pattern of indigenous survivance in a neocolonial world that can be supported through language instruction at the university level.

Chapter Two lays the theoretical foundations for hybridity and the third space, which are central concepts throughout this thesis, by examining the historical processes of indigenous education in the United States and the fight to decolonize educational spaces. Here I am interested mainly in the university language classroom as a third space, since that is the setting of my three interviews. Chapter Three contains the ethnographic data, looking specifically at the ideological shift and blend among indigenous language teachers at the University of Oklahoma. Chapter Four conceptualizes the data of the previous chapter as indicative of a heteroglossia of language ideologies among language instructors. Here I bring the focus back to the central idea in this thesis: the necessity of supporting complex and varied language ideologies in the university classroom as a practice of decolonizing an academic space and supporting indigenous survivance.

Chapter 2: Creating an Ideological Third Space in the University Language Classroom

The history of indigenous education in the United States is fraught with colonialism and oppression. Through the forced assimilation of the boarding school era, the classroom space has historically been a site of linguistic and cultural genocide for indigenous students, and it is still one of many "contemporary sites of resistance and oppression" (Loomba et al. 2005, 1) through English-only standardized testing and a Eurocentric perspective in both language and educational methodologies. Because the classroom has been a space that forcefully removes indigenous languages, cultures, and knowledges, many have argued for the implementation of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy in order to create a third space (Bhabha 1994) in the classroom that combines both indigenous and Euro-American languages and cultures into a hybridity that is neither of the colonizer nor the Other but a space of multilingual and multicultural celebration and learning. While most of the literature on creating a third space in the classroom concerns public school classrooms, the idea is easily extended to a university setting, and specifically an indigenous language classroom. Indigenous language classes at the university level offer the opportunity to decolonize a Westernized academy by creating a physical third space in the classroom that supports language and culture revitalization and indigenous survivance. Particularly salient to this discussion is the role of language ideologies and the dialectic clash between Euro-American and indigenous ideologies. In this chapter, I discuss these theoretical concepts as a background for the ethnographic data in Chapter Two.

Indigenous Education in the United States

Indigenous education in the United States has a long history of violence and oppression. The classroom space, specifically in compulsory K-12 education, continues to be a site of linguicide and cultural genocide, as current education and language policies continue to oppress the rights of indigenous students. The boarding school era, which could easily be considered the most violent, resulted in the outright linguicide of hundreds of indigenous languages (Reyhner and Eder 2004; Stein 1997). Since "public sentiment overwhelmingly favored destruction by civilization rather than by killing" (Utley 1964, 35), boarding schools offered a way to assimilate indigenous students into Euro-American culture through forced religious conversion and a ban on speaking their own languages (Barker 1997, 56-7). This "institutionalized cultural genocide" (48) which led to the "breakdown of traditional American Indian educational practices" (Stein 1997, 74) resulted not only in the loss of languages and cultures, but also the trauma of an entire generation of indigenous students. Alongside the eradication of spoken indigenous languages, boarding schools also contributed to an equally detrimental ideological shift. Students were shamed into feeling disgust for their languages, leading many to choose not to teach that language to their own children. This shift was perpetuated by the collapse of hundreds of indigenous languages into the single category of "speaking Indian" in popular culture, which resulted in reductionist views of indigenous languages and cultures (Meek 2006).

While the outright assimilationist policies of the boarding school era have been mostly eradicated, the current situation of indigenous languages in the classroom is still bleak. Educational language policies continue to be ones of subversive dominance, leaving minority languages and cultures without support or even space to exist. There have, however, been some attempts to reverse the previous policies with new ones, most notably the Native American Languages Act of 1990 (NALA). NALA was implemented largely due to the influence of the grassroots work of Indigenous communities, and as such represents an innovative and unique form of policy creation (Warhol 2011). It states the right of indigenous communities to speak and preserve their languages, and promotes "tribal sovereignty and self-determination in education and language policy" (Combs and Nichols 2012, 107). As an assertion of indigenous rights and sovereignty, NALA is a "practice of power" (Levinson & Sutton 2001, 1) in language policy, an area that had not yet seen this type of attempt at balancing power structures. However, many see NALA as "too late and largely ineffectual" (Warhol 2011, 279; see also Shaul 2014) due to a lack of funding and other tangible support the policy provides. The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act of 2006 provided some financial support for NALA in the form of grants for Native language education, but for the context of indigenous languages in the classroom it is still largely an ideological policy with few practical implications (Warhol 2012).

As the first policy to attempt a reversal of the previous assimilationist language policies in education, NALA represents a significant step forward for indigenous linguistic rights, despite somewhat lacking the ability to provide practical support. Unfortunately, the most recent widespread educational policy in the United States had significant effects on language in the K-12 classroom, taking a step backward instead of continuing what NALA had started. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) mandates standardized testing in English and punishes schools that do not meet benchmark scores. The purpose of this policy is to close the achievement gap between minority students and their Euro-American peers (Garcia 2008). Cultural differences are one of the major contributors to the "education debt" that minority and students have accumulated over time (Ladson-Billings 2006)[1], as is the intergenerational trauma that resulted from the boarding school era. While NCLB seemed to be a viable way to address these issues, in actuality it "thwarted the goal of cultural sensitivity" with emphasis on high-stakes testing in areas like math and science forcing culturally relevant programs to be decreased. This focus "draws attention away from improving the social, mental, and physical well-being of Native children" and "actually increased student dropout rates" in a variety of educational contexts, as well as having disastrous consequences for indigenous languages in the classroom (Reyhner & Hurtado 2008, 84). Because these standardized tests are so high-stakes, NCLB "overrides" culturally relevant pedagogy (Klug 2012, 71) and "forces [teachers] to abandon pedagogical practices that they believe to be crucial in educating their children and sustaining their culture," which results in linguistic and cultural oppression as well as academic failure (Balter and Grossman 2009, 19). The "assimilationist ideology and teaching practices" (Patrick 2008, 66) that NCLB promotes is a direct assault on indigenous linguistic rights and sovereignty over the education of their children (Winestead, Lawrence, Brantmeier, and Frey 2008; Combs and Nichols 2012).

With language education policies that "normalize European-American dominance" (Watanabe 2008, 119) and create "a façade for assimilation" (Patrick 2008, 78) despite paying lip service to endangered Indigenous languages, it is not surprising that only a few successful bilingual programs have been sustained. Programs like a bilingual and bicultural Salish-English school in Montana that Ngai (2012) documents, the trilingual public magnet school Puente de Hózhó in Arizona, or the Hawaiian immersion school system that runs from Pūnana Leo (daycare) through PhD level (McCarty 2012) are examples of success that can be used as a model for language policies and other schools, but the vast majority of indigenous students do not have access to education in their heritage language or culture. Additionally, these programs, though successful, are also being impacted by the negative language policy of NCLB. The results of recent language policies in education make clear the need to create and implement new ones. The recently passed Every Student Succeeds Act, which effectively replaces NCLB, may have a more positive impact on K-12 language programs in public schools, but it is too soon to tell. One way indigenous education advocates and researchers have addressed the issue of creating a more inclusive language policy is by looking at the K-12 classroom site as a potential "third space," where indigenous and Euro-American languages, cultures, and ideologies could be combined in a hybridity of multilingual and multicultural celebration and learning.

---

[1] Education debt has commonly been conceptualized as an achievement gap, but this can be a problematic framing that further alienates minority students.

Dialectics, Hybridity, and the Third Space

The ideas of hybridity and the third space come from the vast field of postcolonialism, building specifically off structuralist theories of synthesis and binary opposition. Levi-Strauss (1963) studied the nature of social structures themselves, positing that they are made up mainly of binary oppositions. These binary oppositions consist of a thesis and antithesis set against each other, with the space in the middle having the potential to create new culture and meaning. This space allows for the unification of the binary opposition in a synthesis that combines elements of both the thesis and antithesis. The unification of a binary by finding synthesized meaning that transcends the original opposition is modeled on the Hegelian dialectic. Though Hegel himself never used the terms, the goal of this dialectical model is to create a synthesis of the thesis and antithesis presented in the binary itself. It is in the synthesis of these binary oppositions that we find culture and meaning. The importance of synthesis is that it is not the result of one side of the binary dominating the other, but rather an ideological shift that deconstructs the binary and allows for parts of both the thesis and antithesis to coexist. Because culture is dynamic and fluid (Acheraïou 2011, 90), these ideological shifts often result in varied iterations of hybridity from the same thesis and antithesis. The fluidity and variance of ideological hybridities will be further discussed in Chapter Four.

It was postcolonial theorist Homi Bhabha (1994) who coined the ideas of both hybridity and the third space. To him, these two concepts were one and the same (Acheraïou 2011, 90). He goes back to the Hegelian dialectic model, positing that it is not the two opposing "original moments from which the third emerges" that makes up "the importance of hybridity," but rather that hybridity is "the 'third space' which enables other positions to emerge" (Bhabha 1994, 211). In other words, the thesis and antithesis of the original binary are of little importance; it is in the synthesis where hybridity forms and creates a space for new meaning – the third space. Like Levi-Strauss's concept of synthesis, the third space "is the 'inter' – the cutting-edge of translation and negotiation, the in-between space – that carries the burden of the meaning of culture" (38). The synthesis of the third space is more than a space for a new hybridity, however. The creation of a synthesis allows for a new thesis and antithesis to emerge, which in turn create the possibility for a new dialectic and eventual synthesis in a cyclical process.

A major goal of postcolonial thought is identifying “contemporary sites of resistance and oppression” (Loomba et al. 2005, 1). The exploration of the third space across many different fields offers the opportunity not only to identify these sites but to reclaim them for a new and less polarizing ideology (Bhabha 1994). This hybridity “aims to recreate an epistemic balance in which…both the West and non-West would be recognized as worthy contributors to civilization” (Acheraïou 2011, 189), that would allow for a synthesis of colonizer and Other. Synthesis is not always the correct response to colonial violence and destruction, as it has the potential to minimize or ignore the experiences of the oppressed in favor of the oppressor. However, in situations the involve a synthesis of people from different backgrounds, such as a K-12 classroom with large populations of both indigenous and non-indigenous students, such a hybridity can be supported as a way to reclaim space for indigenous languages, cultures, and ideologies within a typically Western space. In the section below, I discuss the widely studied application of the third space theoretical model to indigenous K-12 classrooms, but this theoretical model is also applicable to indigenous language classrooms at the university level. The university classroom represents a Western space that forms a binary opposition with the indigenous languages being taught there, and the exploration of a third space in the university classroom supports decolonization within the academy, which will be discussed further below and in Chapter Four.

The Indigenous Classroom as a Third Space

The K-12 classroom has been a common site of study for researchers who study the implementation of third space theory into real-world contexts. One of the major ways the creation of a third space in education is attempted is through the implementation of Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (CRP), which focuses on helping students achieve academic success, maintain their cultural competence, and develop “a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the social order” (Ladson-Billings 1995, 160). Sometimes referred to as culturally based education (Beaulieu 2006), CRP tries to “reconceptualize curriculum as a cultural practice” (Richardson 2006, 284) through an increased recognition of the role that culture plays in learning (Agbo 2004). There is a spectrum of CRP, ranging from the inclusion of some non-dominant culture into a smaller aspect of the curriculum to the call for an “indigenization of our educational system” (Deloria and Wildcat 2001, vii). The literature is not exclusively limited to indigenous education, but those particular minorities are often the focus because of their unique situations as minority communities without majority populations elsewhere.

CRP stresses the “relative nature of truth” (Calsoyas 2005, 301) as the reason for the inclusion of other cultures into all aspects of the curriculum (Stephenson Mallot, Waukau, and Waukau-Villagomez 2009; Deloria and Wildcat 2001). Richardson (2006) points out the need to recognize the evolving and fluid nature of cultures and relations between them, in contrast to viewing Indigenous cultures as static and somehow lacking. Deloria and Wildcat (2001) show how Indigenous metaphysics, particularly concepts of power and place, create a way of knowing and teaching that is vastly different from the Euro-American standard currently prevalent in schools. The common underline of CRP is a push towards the "move from monoculturalism to multiculturalism" (Tikly 2009, 41) in education. This suggested third space hybridity is meant to be a space for the "collision between truths" (Calsoyas 2005, 302) and a "performative site where national culture is not merely reflected, but actively produced" (Richardson 2006, 290). The need to challenge currently accepted binaries is reinforced throughout the literature (Richardson 2006; Tikly 2009), as is the importance of both (all) cultures learning from and understanding each other in an effort to create a hybridity in the third space (Smith 2006; Deloria and Wildcat 2001). Alongside these somewhat theoretical concepts, Castango and Brayboy (2008) warn that CRP must not be "reduced to essentializations," but instead requires systematic change in a true "shift in teaching methods, curricular materials, teacher dispositions, and school-community relations" (942-3). Agbo (2004) also mentions the practical aspects of CRP, including the necessity of orientating teachers to the community and culture they will be working in. Nancy Sharp, a Yup'ik math teacher in Alaska who created a third space in her classroom by combining Yup'ik and Euro-American knowledges and ways of teaching, is a practical example of the implementation of CRP into a public school classroom (Lipka et al. 2005; Lipka et al. 2007; Webster, Wiles, Civil, and Clark 2005).

The main purpose behind the development of CRP is "improving the education and increasing the academic achievement" of minority students (Castango and Brayboy 2008, 941). However, Deloria and Wildcat (2001) explicitly state their view of CRP as "not about raising standards or improving test scores" (9), but instead about the inclusivity of cultures and learning different knowledges in different ways. For Rizvi

(2009), CRP is a fight against “contemporary social, political, economic, and cultural practices” that are “located within the process of cultural domination through the imposition of imperialist structures of power” (47). Tikly (2009) also shares this view of CRP as a political tool that can help the move towards anti-imperialism. Calsoyas (2005) holds a more humanistic view of the purpose of CRP: “Education can wither or distort the human spirit, or it can enlarge the souls of all participants, teachers and learners” (309).

Many forms of CRP also focus on linguistic needs as part of the curriculum (Fordham 1998; Oda 2000; Cohen and Allen 2012; McCarty and Nichols 2014). Such linguistically focused pedagogy is likewise concerned with challenging dominant power structures in education, but also includes the desire for “formalized inclusion of Native languages within official curriculum” (Fordham 1998, 47). The reasoning behind aspiring towards linguistic inclusivity in education varies among researchers, but one common thread is the positioning of language (including education in that language) as human rights (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006; Skutnabb-Kangas 2009; Watanabe 2008). Another is a focus on the power behind language, especially in the context of education (Fairclough 1989; Fordham 1998). Oda (2000) argues that “language is used as a means of controlling students ideologically” (117) and points to the unequal power relations between student and teacher, especially when the student is part of a minority group (121). This power dynamic can create linguistic hierarchies, which constitute symbolic violence against minority students (Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzman 2006, 28). Linguistic hierarchies are created not only within a classroom, but also through policy such as NCLB, which positioned indigenous nations as even less powerful in the context of sovereignty in education (Cohen and Allen 2012). Language policy can be a “powerful mechanism for the eradication of Indigenous and other minoritized mother tongues” (McCarty and Nichols 2014, 107). Because language is cultural capital (Bourdieu 1977; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Cohen and Allen 2012), “implementing uniform standards to drive instruction and assessments has undemocratic consequences for [Indigenous] communities” (Cohen and Allen 2012, 762), as it keeps indigenous students from growing in their own cultural capital and therefore from growing in power. Indigenous languages are kept in Safety Zones that draw “the boundaries between safe and dangerous cultural difference,” thus keeping them in a place of powerlessness (Lomawaima and McCarty 2006, 5; McCarty 2013, 43).

In addition to larger power structures, individual attitudes towards the power of their own language are important to linguistically focused pedagogy. Youth sometimes give up speaking their heritage language because they are “keenly aware of the legacy of oppression that has marginalized their language” (McCarty, Romero, and Zepeda 2006, 107; Lee 2009) and they are ashamed of that identity of powerlessness. Conversely, teaching Indigenous/First Nations languages in schools has positive effects on the formation of identity and academic achievement (McCarty 2009, 2012; Agbo 2004; Bowles 2012). Linguistically focused pedagogy advocates for multilingual education that “seeks to actively empower the learners and their communities” (Panda and Mohanty 2009, 301) and break the perceived binary between Native languages and identities and academic success (Lee 2009).

The implementation of linguistically focused pedagogy is the creation of a hybridity of language practices that creates a space for the language in the classroom (Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzman 2006). This creates a bridge between local and national languages “without homogenizing the beauty of diversity” (Panda and Mohanty 2009, 6). Important in creating this hybridity are “local epistemologies” (Balter and Grossman 2009, 24) and dialogue with community instead of a rigid, fixed view of culture (Panda and Mohanty 2009). In both CRP and linguistically focused pedagogy, researchers point to the need for awareness and activism, as well as the use of research to support policy creation and implementation (Shohamy 2006; Hornberger 2006).

Within the K-12 classroom, taking two different languages and cultures and blending them together as the thesis and antithesis into a hybridity which manifests itself in the physical space of a classroom is not to erase the original of either, but rather to create a hybridity that allows a place where they can coexist on equal terms. The creation of a third space hybridity in the classroom that is neither of the colonizer nor the Other but a space of multilingual and multicultural celebration and learning is a necessary step in equalizing the power structures between Indigenous and Euro-American languages and cultures and helping Indigenous students regain the cultural capital that was stolen from them. Because many K-12 classroom serve large numbers of indigenous students alongside non-indigenous students, such a third space helps to reclaim physical and ideological space for indigenous students. As many researchers have noted, K-12 schools have a unique responsibility to participate in the re-emplacing of these languages and cultures in a place of prestige and power because of their role in the linguicide and cultural genocide of indigenous peoples.

The University Classroom as a Third Space

Most of the literature involving education and the third space is focused on the K-12 classroom, but the university classroom is also an important site for third space reclamation. The main arguments behind implementing CRP and linguistically focused pedagogy in public school classrooms cite the damage caused by the boarding school era and the compulsory nature of K-12 education as reasons why creating a third space is necessary for the linguistic, cultural, and educational rights of indigenous students. These arguments are not directly applicable to the university setting, as postsecondary education is not compulsory and most universities do not have direct links to boarding schools. Additionally, the majority of students in indigenous language classes at the university level are not indigenous, so the creation of a third space is not as linked to language and cultural revitalization. However, universities are still "contemporary sites of resistance and oppression" (Loomba et al. 2005, 1), and as such are prime candidates for the creation and implementation of third spaces for the purpose of decolonizing a traditionally Western space.

One particularly poignant argument for reexamining the role of university classroom space is that all universities in the United States are built on colonized and stolen land. Gould (1992) addresses this issue directly in "The Problem of Being 'Indian,'" saying "it is obvious that there is not a university in this country that is not built on what was once native land" (81). Though university classrooms are not directly affected by oppressive and assimilationist language and education policies like NCLB, they are sites of tension between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples, cultures, languages, and ideas. The physical space of the classroom is important in this analysis. For many indigenous peoples land is more than simply a space to exist, it is intimately connected to the people, language, and culture that stem from it. The wisdom of a people sits literally in the land they come from (Basso 1996). Gould's reminder that all universities sit on this already claimed land highlights her insistence that we "should reflect on this over and over, and understand this fact as one fundamental point about the relationship of Indians to academia" (81-82). The physical space of the classroom represents a binary opposition between indigenous knowledge situated in the land and traditions of the people who live(d) there and the Euro-American knowledge to be taught in the classes held in that space, opening the possibility for a third space that combines those knowledges, cultures, languages, and peoples.

Cherokee scholar and poet Qwo-li Driskill (2015) discusses how creating a third space in the university classroom is an important part of decolonizing education. As a teacher of rhetoric, ze[2] shows how including indigenous rhetorics in hir curriculum is inherently decolonial, since "part of decolonization is for both Native and non-Native people to engage with Native rhetorical practices" (59). This blend of rhetorics within a singular class is a hybridity that creates a physical third space in Driskill's classes. Ze is attentive to the importance of the physical space, claiming that "it is our responsibility to provide spaces in our classrooms for students to engage in indigenous practices" (74). Powell (2004) also argues for a hybridity of knowledges in the classroom, saying,

> "[We] must share some understanding of one another's beliefs. We don't have to *believe* one another's beliefs, but we do have to acknowledge their

---

[2] Driskill prefers to be identified with the nonbinary pronouns ze/hir/hirs.

> importance, understand them as real, and respect/honor them in our dealings with each other (42).

This is an important point in the argument for creating a third space in a classroom. The idea is to privilege both knowledges, cultures, and languages equally, and to create an environment where understanding another's beliefs is the goal. The point is not to convince others to believe our own beliefs, but rather to create a synthesis that respects and honors a hybridity of beliefs. In the physical space of the university classroom, Euro-American knowledges, cultures, and languages are the antithesis brought through colonization, while indigenous knowledges, cultures, and languages is the thesis that existed in the land long before. The clash that happens in the physical classroom is an opportunity for the third space to emerge, the decolonizing space that Driskill and Powell show us in their work.

There is a substantial body of literature that exemplifies the practical creation of a third space in a public school classroom (Beaulieu 2006; Bowles 2012; Garcia, Skutnabb-Kangas, and Torres-Guzmán 2006; Lipka et al. 2005; Lipka, Sharp, Adams, and Sharp 2007; McCarty 2012; Ngai 2012; Webster, Wiles, Civil, and Clark 2005), but far less so for postsecondary education. Driskill's (2015) pedagogical methodology of weaving together indigenous and non-indigenous rhetorics in hir classroom is one concrete example, as are a few others published in the same collection: *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics* (King, Gubele, and Anderson 2015). The examples above discuss third spaces in a variety of university classrooms that blend indigenous and Euro-American knowledges, cultures, and languages in different ways, but none examine a classroom devoted solely to language instruction. The indigenous language classroom is a space that offers substantial opportunity for hybridity because of the inevitable blend of languages and cultures within a traditionally Westernized academy. This hybridity is significantly different than the hybridity in K-12 schools, with different overall goals. K-12 classrooms are able to serve as spaces of language revitalization, especially when they serve large populations of indigenous students. University language classrooms generally serve far more non-indigenous students than indigenous ones, and as such the hybridity achieved is focused more on decolonizing a traditionally Western space. As Driskill says, “it is our responsibility as both Native and non-Native scholars and educators living on occupied land to disrupt colonial projects through our work” (74), and an indigenous language classroom provides the opportunity to disrupt a Westernized academy by creating a third space that includes indigenous knowledges, languages, and cultures.

The Third Space of Language Ideologies

Alongside the blending of knowledges, languages, and cultures, the indigenous language classroom also opens the unique opportunity for a blending of language ideologies. There are some distinct differences between traditionally a Euro-American language ideology and many indigenous language ideologies. Kroskrity and Field (2009) sum up this distinction nicely: “Euro-American language ideologies emphasize the denotational and referential functions of ‘words for things,’ many Native Americans possess language ideologies that view language and speech more ‘performatively’ – as a more powerful and creative force that ‘makes’ the natural and social worlds they inhabit” (10). Saussure, in *Course in General Linguistics* (1916), explicated his theory that language is an arbitrary system of references that is made up of various signs, each containing a signifier (sound-image) and signified (concept). The idea that language is simply a way to communicate an idea or refer to an object seems self-evident to many from a Euro-American background, but in reality there are other ways to conceptualize what language is.

Indigenous ways of conceptualizing language are often starkly different. In these ideologies, “words are real,” meaning that “an utterance is the same as any other action—to speak (or sing) words is to cause the action or circumstances portrayed in the words” (Shaul 2015, 51). The idea that words can have an effect on our physical and spiritual realities has been long-studied in linguistic anthropology, beginning with Wilhelm von Humboldt’s study of the way language shapes thought processes. Drawing from this, both Sapir and Whorf posited theories of language as a key to thought and worldview. In *Language, Thought, and Reality* (1956) Whorf draws out this idea even further, showing how language has the power to influence our realities and the way we understand them. These realities can be part of the physical world, but are also often social or spiritual realities that are shaped by language use. Austin (1962) called language with the power to accomplish something in the world “performative utterances,” showing that phrases such as “I now pronounce you man and wife” do more than refer to a situation, but rather constitute the doing of an action. Performative language creates a new reality, one that didn’t exist before the utterance was spoken. Silverstein (1979) also describes how even seemingly simple language such as a pronoun can create a new social reality for the speaker and listener. As seen in the previous two examples, even Euro-American languages utilize performativity in multiple contexts. The important difference here is between ideologies; many speakers of Euro-American languages focus on the referential aspects of language while speakers of indigenous languages tend to focus on performativity.

Understanding the variation in language ideologies is also central to linguistic anthropology. Lisa Conathan (2006) describes how these ideologies can be understood by using previous documentation to study past speech communities, rather than just language itself. Additionally, many ethnographers have been able to access indigenous language ideologies through their interviews. Shorter (2006) describes the performativity of language that marks many, if not all, indigenous language ideologies. Through a detailed ethnography of the Yoeme people, he describes language not as a system of references but as "embodied action" (13) that creates an arena for linguistic performance that "is at once an act of memory and a ritual sharing of identity, grounded in remembering and re-membering the places of their ancestors" (39). For the Yoeme, the primary function of language is not communication or reference, but rather to perform things into reality. Similarly, Marshall (2016) finds through her ethnography of Neo-Pentecostalism among the Navajo that "Navajo words are understood to contain the power literally to perform actions in the world" (82). Speaking Navajo is so much more than simply communicating or referring to an idea; rather, "the speaking and signing of Navajo words is regarded as having the power to change the fabric of reality" (86). In the famous book *Wisdom Sits in Places*, Basso (1996) details the power of language in literally making the world, this time from a Western Apache context.

Another important aspect of these ideologies is the deep and unseverable connection between language, religion, and all other aspects of life, which is also a foundational concept of anthropological thought. Tylor (1871) famously defined culture as “that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society” (1). The idea that everything is intimately bound together is widespread, from the connection of Hebrew to Jewish culture, identity, and religious practices to the insistence that speaking English is a necessary part of American culture and identity. There is also an opposing perspective, however, known as structures of common difference. In this conceptualization these things are all at least somewhat separate, allowing a person to exchange one aspect of their way of being while keeping everything else unchanged; for example, one could exchange Navajo traditional lifeways for Christianity without disturbing their use of the Navajo language or other aspects of their culture, something that was encouraged by some mission schools (Kroskrity and Field 2009). In many indigenous ideologies, however, neither religion or nor language is a bounded category that can remain separate from the other. As evidenced by the above ethnographic examples, there are many indigenous language communities that still hold an ideology of inseparability between language and religion, as well as other aspects of identity.

Like spoken language and other aspects of culture, both material and psychological, indigenous and Euro-American language ideologies clash in many dominant institutions, including the classroom space. The “continuous influence of nonindigenous ideologies…on Native communities through their expression in its dominant institutions” (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 6) can be conceptualized as an ideological shift, as I will discuss in Chapter Three, but it can also open the possibility for an ideological hybridity to occur. Because schools are “sites of ideological production” (Anderson 2009, 60), the classroom space is one that can be reclaimed as a decolonial site of hybridity rather than one that forces the dominant language ideology on students. There is a dialectical struggle inherent in the classroom, as well as other public institutions, because “attitudes and policies about Native American languages are enmeshed within larger public spheres…through which different agents with particular goals promote ideologies that compete for authority” (Neely and Palmer 2009, 271). In the “colonial and postcolonial contact experiences” of education (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 6), a variety of anti-indigenous “ideologies of contempt” (Dorian 1998) often overpower indigenous ideologies, resulting in education policy and practice that removes indigenous languages, cultures, knowledges, and ideologies from the classroom, as discussed above.

Even in spaces that are dedicated to creating a decolonial third space, such as an indigenous language classroom, language ideologies are extremely important. Neely and Palmer (2009) give an example of the ways a Euro-American language ideology can impact indigenous language revitalization, even when the space of revitalization is dedicated to indigenous language, culture, and knowledge:

> “Pedagogical wisdom holds that a one-to-one phonemic correspondence and a one-word, one-form spelling system are easier for language learners to internalize. These types of ‘professional language ideologies,’ found within the discourse on pedagogy, can be at cross-purposes with communities’ own understandings and valuations of language, creativity, and syncretism” (276).

In this case, the professional language ideology values a certain kind of writing system, while community language ideologies value different things. If the professional Euro-American ideology is forced onto an indigenous language, it can have detrimental consequences for language revitalization efforts. Just as there must be a room for a third space that allows for hybridity in order to decolonize the physical university language classroom, there also must be a third space for language ideologies that allows the hybridization of competing ideologies in order to serve the needs of a complex indigenous language community (Anderson 2009). Because “conflict and contradiction between language ideologies may exist even for a single individual” (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 22), a third space allows the blending of these ideologies in a way that supports the individuality of indigenous survivance and revitalization.

Conclusion

Education has been and continues to be a major contributing factor to the colonization of indigenous people around the world, at both compulsory and university levels. As a resistance to this colonization, many have argued for the implementation of CRP and linguistically focused pedagogy, especially in elementary and secondary public school classrooms, in order to create a third space in the classroom that allows for a hybridity of languages and cultures. Such a third space is an opportunity for indigenous languages and cultures to reclaim a place in an academic setting. While most of the literature about creating a third space in education focuses on compulsory public school classrooms, the indigenous language classroom at the university level provides a unique opportunity for the decolonization of academic settings by bringing indigenous languages, and consequently indigenous cultures and ways of knowing, into a Euro-American dominated space. In the third space of the university language classroom, it is important to support not only a hybridity of languages and cultures, but also a hybridity of language ideologies. The ways people think and feel about language are complex and varied, as will be further discussed in Chapter Four. Because of the clear difference between performative and referential language ideologies, this variation in endangered and indigenous language communities is easily conceptualized as an ideological shift towards more referential language and away from a traditionally indigenous language ideology. However, it is important to understand such variation as more than a simple ideological shift, and to support it in the language classroom. In Chapter Three, I will discuss three ethnographic examples of indigenous language teachers at the University of Oklahoma that exemplify ideological variation in the language classroom, showing how they all contribute to language revitalization and a decolonized academy in various ways. In order to fully decolonize the indigenous language classroom at the university level, it is critical to understand the role of language ideologies and to support their hybridity.

Chapter 3: Case Studies of Ideological Hybridity

The University of Oklahoma (OU) Native American Languages program currently offers classes in four indigenous languages – Creek, Cherokee, Kiowa, and Choctaw. Each of these is offered as a three-course sequence that allows students to fulfill their general education language credit at the university. All of the Native American language instructors at the OU use their classroom as a third space, blending an indigenous language and culture into a Western university classroom. The ways these third spaces are created are widely varied, but each contributes to indigenous revitalization and the decolonization of an academic space. Language ideologies play an important role in this process. Through the ethnographic snapshots in this chapter, I will delineate some of the varied language ideologies I found among these instructors, focusing on the hybridity between referential and performative as discussed in Chapter Two. Here I will show how these language ideologies are expressed through each instructor's pedagogical methodology, using their own words. These findings will be further discussed in Chapter Four.

Since contact and the subsequent onslaught of colonialism, Euro-American cosmologies and ideologies have been encroaching on indigenous ones. Boarding schools were unquestionably "instrumental in promoting alienation from ancestral teachings and language" (Marshall 2016, 4). Leanne Hinton (1994) brought attention to this issue in her famous book *Flutes of Fire*, where she studied the way language embodies such ancestral teaching in the context of California's indigenous languages, showing how colonial education practices contributed to such alienation. This "fragmentation of traditional lifeways" (Marshall 2016, 43) through banning indigenous languages and cultural practices is a first step in promoting linguicide (Zuckermann and Walsh, 2011). Prior to the implementation of federal Indian boarding schools during the nineteenth century, indigenous education was not aimed at complete linguicide, though there was some language shift as a result (Kroskrity and Field 2009). Rather, the purpose was to convert indigenous peoples to Christianity, and in that aim many missionaries learned indigenous languages and used them in their classrooms (16). Boarding schools were, however, "dedicated to the eradication of indigenous languages along with all other vestiges of Native cultures" (16). By the late 1800s, all education was required to be in English, something Kroskrity and Field declare "a policy of cultural and specifically linguistic erasure" (16).

As I discuss in the ethnographic examples below, a major effect of colonialism was a shift in language ideologies among indigenous speakers. While it is easy to see the ways indigenous children had their languages beaten out of them, often casing psychological damage that prevented them from passing the language down to their own children even if they did remember how to speak it, the ways they were socialized to consider language as a system of references are not so obvious. In forcing children into assimilative education, boarding schools not only caused them to stop speaking their language, but actually and likely unwittingly socialized them into thinking about language through a Euro-American ideology. Silverstein (1998) and Samuels (2006), as well as many others, show that such a shift is not an uncommon result among indigenous language users. This shift is not a clear switch from indigenous to Euro-American ideologies, however. Rather, there are variant hybrid ideologies that have emerged through the clash, as I will further explicate in Chapter Four. Robbins (1977) exemplifies this shift with a poignant quote from an indigenous speaker, “My mind is white; my complexion is Indian; but I think white” (163). Mission schools also contributed to this ideological shift. Though they did not often place a strong emphasis on learning English and allowed students to go on speaking their own languages, the focus on translating the Bible into various indigenous languages marked a strong Euro-American language ideology – the idea that words can be translated. In order for a word to be translated without consequences to meaning, it must first have a primary function of referring to an object or idea, so that a word that references that same object or idea in a different language can be used to replace the original word in a translation. In this way, missionaries as translators were an important part of the force that socialized indigenous people into thinking about language as referential (Samuels 2006).

In thinking about ideological variation and possible shift, it is also necessary to consider the ways in which language might appear referential when it in fact is not. Just as the clash of a more referential language ideology and a more performative one result in a complex hybridity of ideologies rather than a simple ideological shift, the ideologies that result from that clash are not all part of a dichotomy between the two. The concept of framing in linguistic anthropology opens an opportunity to consider seemingly referential language instead as vocabulary that “reflects spheres of knowledge developed within particular societies and contain concepts unique to particular cultures, such as names for religious figures or social customs” (O’Neill 2006, 305). Especially in an indigenous language classroom, where names of animals are often one of the first things taught, it is important to remember that what is a simple reference in English is often a word that can “capture an entire episode of outstanding cultural significance in a single highly suggestive image" (311) in the indigenous language. Many names of animals in indigenous languages include rich data about their natural and mythical histories, which often includes knowledge about their movements, prey, and habitat as well. It is easy to look at such language as purely referential, but the embodiment of such rich culturally knowledge within a single word reminds us of the nuance and complexity inherent in language ideologies. In the ethnographic data below, this complexity becomes even more apparent.

Ethnographic Snapshot 1 – Mvskoke

The Mvskoke language is a branch of the Muskogean language family, which includes Alabama, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Koasati, and Mikasuki. It is often spelled "Muscogee," like the Muscogee Nation, or "Muskogee," like the Oklahoma town, but I have chosen to use the spelling "Mvskoke" as it reflects how local language revitalists and instructors have chosen to describe their language and the standard orthography of the language itself. According to the Ethnologue (2016), it is ranked as '6b (Threatened)' on the Expanded Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale (EGIDS), which measures linguistic vitality and endangerment. The prose description for this EGIDS ranking claims "The language is used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users," but in reality few people of childbearing age or younger use the language at all (Ethnologue 2016, Fishman 1991). There are approximately 4,000 speakers in both the Muscogee Nation and Seminole Nation in Oklahoma as well as a few hundred in Seminole Tribe of Florida. Sometimes the language is referred to as Creek-Seminole instead of Mvskoke, and often one of the dialect names is substituted for the language as a whole, but in order to avoid slippage of terminology I use Mvskoke and differentiate between the dialect of the Muscogee Nation, Creek, and the dialect of the Seminole Nation in Oklahoma, Seminole.

Before the forced removal of the Creek Confederacy in 1832, the Muscogee people lived throughout the Southeastern United States, specifically Alabama, Georgia, Florida (Innes, Alexander, and Tilkens 2004). The Creek Confederacy included the Muscogee Creek, Seminole, Chickasaw, and Choctaw peoples, and was formed in the late 1500s as a way to communicate and negotiate with European colonists "as a relatively unified group" (28). During removal, the Seminole Nation fled to Florida while the rest of the groups were relocated to Oklahoma. Some Seminole people stayed in Florida, now making up the Seminole Tribe of Florida, while others eventually relocated to Oklahoma as well. In the late 1800s the passing of the Curtis Act required the Muscogee and Seminole Nations to parcel up tribal land among members, breaking up tribal land holdings and allowing white settlers to purchase the "extra" land (29).

The Mvskoke language embodies the interconnected cosmology of the people who speak it. This kind of connectivity has been well documented among indigenous languages, from Whorf's (1956) study of the Hopi language to O'Neill's (2008) work with the languages of northwest California. Mvskoke cosmology "is an animistic, dualistic, monistic, and relational worldview" (Koons 2016, 91-2) which emphasizes "a belief in the interconnectedness and oneness of all things" (22). Mental, physical, and spiritual aspects of experience are all conceived of as "an inseparable whole," an ideology which is reinscribed through language use (22). As is most evident in ceremonial performance, the language is intimately connected to both spiritual and physical power (Koons 2016). Traditional songs that are sung over medicine or to help "kill game or obtain plant foods" (Innes, Alexander, and Tilkens 2004, 177) exemplify the power that the spoken, or sung, word holds over the spiritual and physical worlds. Singing the proper song over a medicine is important not only because of the musical ritual and embodied performance of the *heles hayv* (doctor), but also because of the actual words of the song (Schultz 1999). In his research on the Seminole Baptists in Oklahoma, Charles Schultz quotes a doctor explaining the importance of language in these ceremonies:

> "The *heles hayv* said: 'It is God that makes the medicine work though me. If the songs are sung correctly, then God hears and works. If the songs are sung incorrect, then God doesn't hear them – it's like so much wind.'" (69)

In order to achieve the desired result, the language, music, and performance of these songs must be correct, otherwise it is just "so much wind." This is the interconnectedness of Mvskoke cosmology. Both the spiritual power of the medicine and the physical result of finding game to hunt are a result of carefully selected and performed words – language is power.

Previous research on Muscogee and Seminole people in the post-contact period focuses on a shift in cosmological ideology that is also shifting and hybrid. Southard (2004) shows how "in the post-colonial, hybrid Muskogee Methodist Church the people of Salt Creek created a new "site of power," a place in which they determined how to appropriate and resist the dominant culture as they created a new institution" (434). Rather than completely assimilate to the colonial religious cosmology "Muskogees reinterpreted Methodism to suit their needs" (435) by creating a hybrid space. Schultz (1999) describes a similar practice among Seminole Baptists:

> "The Seminole Baptists are not assimilated; they are culturally unique and maintain a distinct identity. Moreover, rather than being a huge step towards

> assimilation into the dominant Anglo system, their adoption of Christianity – their church system – actually functions to maintain their unique identity as Seminoles within the dominant Anglo system." (ix)

This practice of hybridity and syncretism is an act of decolonial resistance. The shift of language ideologies is a similar act of resistance and survivance, as will be discussed further in Chapter Four.

Mvskoke Classes at the OU

The Mvskoke class at OU includes both the Creek and Seminole dialects. The instructor, Kevin Roberts-Fields, is a second language user of the Seminole dialect who has been learning and using the language for around fifteen years. He is new to the university, having only taught Mvskoke in the fall semester of 2016, but also teaches a more intensive immersion class in conjunction with Bacone College. At OU, Mr. Roberts-Fields has plans to start an immersion-style program for Mvskoke, including class meetings five days a week for a significant amount of time per day, eventually leading into a bachelor's degree program in the language. He is a highly dedicated and enthusiastic language user and instructor, and fully committed to the revitalization of Mvskoke in Oklahoma.

I met with Kevin on a Thursday morning before his Creek III class. I had been attending several class meetings to gain some insight into his teaching style, so we already had a friendly, relaxed relationship that made the interview flow easily. Because I had already gotten to know his teaching style and dedication to language revitalization, I definitely went in with the assumption that he would hold a more referential language ideology but still engage with the performative aspect of language.

As I prepared my interview questions, I attempted to make them as neutral as possible in order to avoid my base assumptions coloring the outcome as much as possible.

I opened the interview with the simple question: why is teaching Mvskoke is important you? He told me he was doing it for language revitalization, "not just enrichment." The use of the word "enrichment" is particularly interesting to me here, as my own positionality tends to interpret that as deeply connected to revitalization, such as cultural enrichment. However, later on we discussed the importance of including cultural components in the classroom, leading me to realize that this statement had more to do with the seriousness of teaching the language. To Kevin, these language classes are more than an academic requirement or interesting elective for students, they are a means of revitalizing the language and thus are a specifically decolonial practice.

Through my classroom observations, I noticed that Kevin tended to focus on incorporating conversation skills that students might use in real life, including dialogue sequences such as the following:

1. Where are we going to eat?
2. Let's go to ________________.
1. What will you order when you get there?
2. I will order ________________.

This could be due to a variety of things, perhaps it is a strategy to get students to engage during class time, or maybe it is because they are still very low level speakers and this is an easy way to encourage practice. Whatever the reasoning, it is clear that the kind of language being taught in these exercises is purely referential. What is especially interesting is the way this referential language is taught. Kevin utilizes immersion techniques in his classroom, speaking as little English as possible. He repeats the Mvsksoke words and phrases over and over with accompanying pictures or hand motions in order to make his meaning clear to the students. This style of teaching is not uncommon in the second language classroom, but is particularly popular in indigenous language revitalization contexts.

In our interview, I asked Kevin what kinds of cultural aspects he tried to include in teaching, hoping to gain some clarity on the ideology behind using this particular pedagogical method. His answer was fairly straightforward: he is forced to leave "lots" of the cultural aspects out of the current classroom space because of the short class time and a room that was not arranged well. However, the second part of his answer was more complex, as he revealed that in a longer class he would include certain culturally relevant practices, specifically "the way you begin and end things." When I drew this question out further, I found that this includes an address to the morning at the beginning of class and songs to be sung during specific activities. Here we began to dive into cultural and religious ties to language which indicates that perhaps he does not think of language as mainly, or at least purely, referential. Later in the interview, however, he revealed that the proposed immersion-style program will contain mainly similar conversation materials, food, clothing, animals, activities, etc, just in greater quantity and increasing difficulty. To me this indicates a general conceptualization of Mvskoke as a referential language, with the purpose being to train students to use the language in everyday contexts in order to contribute to sustained revitalization. Trying to further draw out this connection between language and religion, I asked him how he felt about teaching hymns as part of the curriculum, a common practice in teaching indigenous languages. Kevin replied that some incorporation of music is good to help with pronunciation, but that he was frustrated with the lack of communicative competence his students had as a result of mainly singing hymns. He did not address the religious aspect of including hymns. Again, his answer indicates that communication is his first priority, and therefore that he sees the language as referential and communicative above anything else.

In response to the first question above Kevin indicated dissatisfaction with the classroom space he was given, so I asked him what a good classroom for teaching Mvskoke would look like. He mentioned that it would need to be arranged differently, specifically with students able to sit in a circle instead of rows facing the front, so I followed up by inquiring if the new arrangement would be indicative of Mvskoke cultural values. He replied by telling me that the space would be arranged according to research in effective second language acquisition (SLA) theory rather than specifically Mvskoke ways of knowing, one of the main reasons being to allow better visuals for the whole class and the ability for physical movement. This answer surprised me. Despite my underlying assumption that he would have a more referential language ideology, I assumed that more traditional Mvskoke lifeways would guide his classroom organization. It is a testament to my own positionality that my first assumption was that he intended to arrange the class according to Mvskoke lifeways, and a clear picture of the differing ideologies we brought to the discussion.

Throughout the rest of the interview, it became even more clear that we tended to talk past each other and conceptualizing language in vastly varying ways. I spent some time trying to come up with questions that would convey what I was trying to ask without leading him to answer in one way or another, so it is worth mentioning that some of the communication issues we experienced could easily have been a result of poor question writing on my part[3]. Because my underlying assumption was that he would have an idea of Mvskoke as performative, I did not prepare to explain the question in more detail. Intending to get him to speak about the physical and performative power of Mvskoke, I asked Kevin what kind of power Mvskoke had and if it was different from the power of English, making sure to mention that I was interested in the power the language had in the physical world. His response was that Mvskoke had the potential to have power, but was still too endangered to currently command any. He continued to say that in order for Mvskoke to gain power it must be normalized as a part of the dominant language and culture, and not be limited to the home. He also mentioned the Maori revitalization motto – "Language must be everywhere" – and pointed out that in order for Mvskoke to have power it must also be everywhere. Here is a crystal-clear example of the different ideologies we had in approaching the topic of power and language. His conceptualization of power for a language is that of resistance against the colonizing forces and the English language, whereas mine focuses on the ability to change the physical and spiritual worlds. His focus on revitalization is evident in this answer, and probably would have caused him to think about his definition of power first even if he did conceptualize of it both ways. However, in conjunction with the rest of our conversation, I think this is continued evidence of his referential and communicative language ideology.

---

[3] I attempted to reach out to Kevin for a follow-up interview to address some of the confusion about the interview questions and discuss his language ideologies more completely, but we were unable to work out an additional interview.

The last topic we discussed concerns language and cognition. Here I hoped to pull apart some of the ways that Kevin conceptualized of language as he was in the process of using it, specifically if he thought of the world differently in Mvskoke than in English. I asked if he thought there was any cognitive difference for himself between using Mvskoke and English, and mentioned that I was interested in the way he felt when speaking each language. I wanted to find out if he felt a contrast in underlying worldview between each language, which is common among speakers of indigenous languages (O'Neill 2012). Here his answers were again focused on language as a communicative tool rather than a way of knowing. He responded that when speaking Mvskoke he has to be more intentional in thinking about what he is saying because he is still actively learning, whereas English comes more naturally to him. We were again coming at a question from such different ideological and academic positionings that we spoke past each other, despite my best efforts to ask a good question and his best efforts to answer exactly what I was saying. Rather than a case of communication breakdown because of a poor working relationship or another outside force, this question, like many of the ones above, evidenced a clash of language ideologies: the referential one of language as a system of references and therefore communicative tool and the performative one of language as a way of knowing and of having the ability to make and remake the world.

Considering both the interview and classroom data, it becomes clear that Kevin conceives of language as a system of reference and communication, a more Euro-American language ideology. However, it is also clear that his commitment to holistic language revitalization reflects an indigenous ideology of language as intimately connected to identity. Additionally, his use of immersion style teaching privileges Mvskoke over English in his classroom, which is also indicative of an indigenous ideology.

Ethnographic Snapshot 2 – Cherokee

Cherokee belongs to the Iroquoian language family and is the only language of the Southern Iroquoian branch. The Northern Iroquoian branch has several languages, including Seneca, Cayuga, Onondaga, Mohawk, and Susquehannock. Iroquoian languages were originally spoken in the Eastern United States and Southern Canada, though Cherokee, Cayuga, and Seneca are now spoken in Oklahoma. There are three federally recognized Cherokee tribes: the Eastern Band in South Carolina and the United Keetoowah Band and the Cherokee Nation in Tahlequah, Oklahoma. There are some dialectal differences between Cherokee speakers in Oklahoma, and larger differences between Oklahoma Cherokee and South Carolina Cherokee. There are approximately 8,500 Cherokee speakers in South Carolina and 14,000 speakers in Oklahoma (Montgomery-Anderson 2015). Even with this relatively large number of speakers, however, Cherokee is still considered endangered. Like Mvskoke, Cherokee is classified as 6b (Threatened) on the EGIDS described as “used for face-to-face communication within all generations, but it is losing users” (Ethnologue 2016, Fishman 1991). A 2001 survey determined that most Oklahoma Cherokee speakers are above 40 years old, meaning that possibilities for intergenerational transmission are quickly disappearing. One of the most unique aspects of the Cherokee language is its writing system – the Cherokee syllabary. Invented by Sequoyah in 1821, the syllabary quickly gained popularity among Cherokee people, resulting in literacy rates nearing ninety percent at the beginning of the nineteenth century (Montgomery-Anderson 2015).

The Cherokees were forcibly removed from their ancestral lands in the southeastern United States in the late 1830s, during what is now known as the Trail of Tears. Out of 17,000 Cherokee people, approximately 4,000 died from "hunger, exposure, and disease" during this time (www.cherokee.org). Some fled to the hills of North Carolina until they could eventually settle there, while most were resettled in what is now Oklahoma. Like the Muscogee and Seminole Nations, the Cherokee Nation was affected by the Curtis Act in the late 1800s, which broke up tribal land holdings and allowed white settlers to take Cherokee lands (Montgomery-Anderson 2015).

Like Mvskoke, the Cherokee language embodies the interconnected cosmology of its people. This cosmology views "language, religion, land, and history as inextricably intertwined" (Tehee 2014, 104). Richard Allen (Cherokee Nation 2003) discusses this interconnectedness, claiming that the "strong association between the Cherokee language and its use in Cherokee spiritual life" (5) is one of the reasons for Cherokee language revitalization success. This connection of language to the spiritual world is indicative of the language ideology that Cherokee has a spiritual power. As I learned from my interview with OU Cherokee instructor Christine Armer, Cherokee medicine men use the Cherokee language when "making the medicine." It is the words themselves that are powerful in this instance, as the medicine men "pray over it using the words, or checking things" in order to give the medicine healing properties. Teuton et. al. (2012) quotes Cherokee speaker Hastings Shade further explaining the power of language in this Cherokee cosmology:

> “As long as we speak to the fire in Cherokee it will not go out, and as long as the terrapins sing around the fire we will have the fire for our use. When the language is gone, the fire will be gone.” (53)

It is important for Cherokees to speak to the fire in the language in order to keep it burning, much like the Mvskoke songs which must have the proper words in order to be heard by God. The fire is more than a practical tool, it is also an important spiritual component of the stomp dance. Christine explained the stomp dance to me as a place “where they pray to the Creator…that's where the smoke takes the words to heaven.” It is language that has the power to create and sustain the fire, which is the means of communicating with the Creator. In this ideology, language is importantly powerful over the spiritual world.

Cherokee language and religious ideologies are shifting and hybrid, just like Mvskoke and most other indigenous languages of North America. Christine informed me that “in Cherokee there's a lot of them that did not take the Anglo way, they took the stomp dance.” However, there are equally as many that adopted the “Anglo way” of Christianity, specifically the Baptist church (Sturm 2002). This religious split can be conceptualized as point of rupture where indigenous and Euro-American ideologies clashed and began to form hybridities. Today, neither Cherokee Christians or those who keep the stomp dance are seen as less Cherokee, making both institutions and their varying ideologies an important part of Cherokee culture (Sturm 2002). The Euro-American ideology of structures of common difference played an important part in this shift, allowing a Euro-American religion to blend with an indigenous language and identity. This has interesting implications for Cherokee language ideologies, as I will show through the ethnographic example below and discuss further in Chapter Four.

Cherokee Classes at OU

Christine Armer is one of two Cherokee instructors at OU and teaches Cherokee I, II, and III. She has been teaching for over thirty years, mainly at OU but also the occasional summer class in her community. A first language speaker of Cherokee, she is a devoted instructor with a relaxed manner that sets her students at ease, as I remember from my own experience as a student in her Cherokee I class. I met with Christine during her Tuesday morning office hour, crouching on the floor of her small office. Our previous relationship gave the interview a relaxed feel, with a good deal of reminiscing about my experiences in her class.

After asking what levels of Cherokee she taught at OU, I began the interview by inquiring about her teaching philosophy. Her response was that "all my students will learn in [the] different learning styles that I teach in the classroom." Later we also discussed what she hoped her students would gain from her classes. I assumed this would have something to do with teaching students to speak the language and language revitalization efforts, but her response was much more down to earth: "Well, you know, let's be realistic, they will not be fluent in three semesters with an hour a day, I mean as long as…by the time they get to Cherokee III they can put words together and be able to do the dialogue, with the paper at first and then…without the paper." The notion that university language classes are not direct contributors to language revitalization surprised me, but throughout the rest of this research I began to see the importance of teaching an indigenous language at the university level for decolonization, rather than revitalization. This answer shows that her efforts are focused on the communicative language in her written dialogues, such as this one from her Cherokee III class:

1. What are you doing?
2. I'm reading a book.
1. I want bread, do you want to go to town?
2. I want some coffee.
1. Let's go.
2. Yes, let's go.

These dialogues are similar to the ones Kevin teaches in Mvskoke, with a focus on everyday communication skills. The language that is taught through these is purely referential, which is likely due to the relevance of this type of communication to her students' lives. These dialogues are prewritten, but one of her goals is to get students to say them quickly and naturally: "they reach the stage of saying that quickly…you know, Nike says 'Just Do It.' and Mrs. Armer says 'just SAY it!' so that's what we do." The high level of attention paid to referential communication in these lessons is indicative of her ideology of language as referential, at least in the context of teaching. However, like Kevin in his Creek III class, Christine uses as little English as possible in her advanced course. Though not quite an immersion style of teaching, the practice of using mostly Cherokee in the classroom is suggestive of an understanding of current second language acquisition practices, but also an indigenous ideology of privileging the language over English.

Since Christine mentioned different learning styles as part of her teaching philosophy, I was curious about what kinds of learning styles she was referring to. She explained that through her undergraduate education she learned how to cater to auditory, kinesthetic, or visual, through her classroom environment and activities, and attempts to incorporate that into her university language classroom as well.

> “I put things in a paper bag, say vocab words, say a marble, a hat, a teddy bear. I put them in the bag and they randomly pick [something] out, they pick out a marble and they have to say it in Cherokee. See and they're holding the marble and they're feeling the marble, so they know *gadayosdi*. The next student picks up the bear, *yona*, just different ways. I'll show a visual, I give them pictures and ask them to say it in Cherokee. And also I use the flyswat method for the college students. I will put the syllabaries on the blackboard and I will say the phonetic sounds. And if I say *ju* they have to find it with the flyswat. And some of them say, I can just hear them now, some of them say ‘I hate this game because I have to do this’ and then some of them "I love this game because I can get it’, you know, that student tells me how they learn that way. So, I implement that into my lessons.”

The ideas of learning styles and the types of activities that go along with it come from a Euro-American pedagogical training model, which Christine blends with an indigenous language into the third space of her classroom. The kind of language taught with these activities is referential, teaching students to associate the word *yona* with the concept of a bear, again suggesting a ideology of language as referential that informs her pedagogical methodology.

Since Christine’s focus on learning styles represent a Euro-American influence on her teaching methodology, I also wanted to find out if she included immersion or Total Physical Response Storytelling[4] techniques in her classroom. I learned that her own “bad experience” as a first language speaker of Cherokee who was thrown into an English speaking first grade informed her view of immersion techniques in the classroom: “From there, I put in my mind…if I ever taught the Cherokee language I would use the skills that I learned on my own, from thinking *well if you taught me this*

---

[4] See Cantoni (1999) for a discussion of Total Physical Response Storytelling in indigenous language teaching.

way, I would have learned English easier." As seen in the example of Kevin's classroom, immersion is a common technique for teaching an indigenous language, particularly because it is seen to be more culturally appropriate because it is not trying to fit a framework created for Indo-European languages. Christine, however, does not use immersion in her classroom because "it would be hard for a student to figure everything out, especially in Cherokee, Cherokee's a complex language." Instead she teaches her students to break down the grammatical structure of Cherokee, using English grammar to help them understand:

> "I make the students go up to the board and they write *dejawegas* and underneath it they write *Are you tired?* I said, all right let's find the *you* part that would be *ja* because it's you I'm talking to you so…they'll circle the *ja* and draw a line up to *you*. Okay let's find the verb, what are you? They'll say *tired* so they'll circle the *wega* and, and draw and arrow to *tired*. I try to do it just like I learned, diagram[ing] and breaking it down, that's your subject, that's your verb. So I do that, I break it all down and then some of them it'll click right away and then others will have to think about it. I'll take it from the very simple way, and then we'll add on."

Teaching grammar by using English structure as a guide is a practical choice because Cherokee's polysynthetic nature makes it difficult to understand without explicitly learning to break the words apart, but also a choice that puts Cherokee into a Euro-American mold of language structure. This is another example of the hybridity of language ideologies present in the classroom, as it at once acknowledges the complex and difficult nature of Cherokee, rather than an ideology that views indigenous languages as primitive or simplistic, while also assuming a one-to-one correlation of grammatical concepts between the two languages, which is indicative of an ideology of language as interchangeable, and therefore referential.

Our next topic of conversation was the way Christine includes Cherokee culture into her classes. The cultural component of the language is an extremely important aspect of the class, and she affirmed that students often gain more respect for the both the language and the culture because it is included as an integral part of the course. This includes telling oral histories and stories relevant to the topic of the day, as she reminded me: “remember at the beginning I told you about Sequoyah, where the tribe came from, and all our cultural background.” Additionally, she includes a hands-on cultural component in Cherokee II – making a traditional basket. During our interview, she showed me some of the baskets made by her previous students. This activity fulfills her personal goal of teaching to different learning styles, since it is a kinesthetic activity, while also incorporating traditional knowledge into the course. She hopes to expand the cultural component of her class in the near future:

> “I'm going to try to start developing some books, and then use the stories. I've started one story about the opossum that lost his tale, and for…my Cherokee III students to be able to do a play [with that story] all in Cherokee.”

These activities reflect an indigenous language ideology of interconnectedness, that language, cultural knowledge, stories, and physical cultural skills are all intimately intertwined and inseparable.

Our final topic of conversation turned towards a more explicit discussion of language ideologies. Since Christine is a first language speaker of Cherokee, I wanted to better understood how she conceived of both English and Cherokee. Going into these questions, I assumed her answers would lean more towards the pre-contact language ideology of Cherokee having power over the spiritual, and possibly physical, worlds because of her status as a first language speaker. This was before I had researched the hybridity that occurred between the Cherokee language and Christianity, and thus the Euro-American language ideology of language as interchangeable and referential. Considering the difficulty I had discussing this issue with Kevin, I attempted to make my questions clearer this time. What I found was that both Christine and Kevin have a similar conceptualization of the power in language, even though they have different backgrounds in regards to speaking their heritage languages.

I started with a question about the differences between speaking Cherokee and English, both cognitively and emotionally. Her answer was surprisingly poignant to me: “Really there's not a difference, because once you learn English, you know, it's just another language.” This points again towards the ideology of language as translatable and interchangeable that accompanied the spread of Christianity, particularly through the mission schools. She went on to elaborate that some things are easier for her to say in Cherokee, while others are easier in English: “there are some words in English that we don't have, so I have to think about a certain ways that, how to put it in Cherokee.” Here there is a bit of a break with the idea that English is “just another language,” and a recognition that not everything is directly translatable across different languages. The ideology expressed here is complex and hybrid, incorporating both sides of the ideological shift described above.

My final question concerned the power of language. After my interview with Kevin, I was very curious which indigenous languages in Oklahoma carried a language ideology similar to the Navajo and Yoeme. Christine informed me that Cherokee does not hold power over the physical world, giving a quick and succinct “no” when I posed the question. She went on to elaborate that medicine men “pray over [the medicine] using the words, or checking things…but the only power that'll have would be like, making the medicine." What was most interesting to me as she talked was that she said "they would say" the words have power when making the medicine, and later continued by saying "that's where *I think they believe* that's the power, you know, that's gonna come back down in words to the medicine man and this power that's going up in words, so the Creator will tell them what to do" (emphasis mine). This gives a clear picture of her conceptualization of the power of Cherokee. Like Kevin, Christine's language ideology does not see Cherokee as having that same kind of power over the physical and spiritual worlds as Navajo and Yoeme, though she is aware of those Cherokee speakers who do conceptualize language in that way. This shows the interesting ideological shift that occurred with the spread of colonialism and Christianity.

Ethnographic Snapshot 3 – Kiowa

Kiowa is part of the Kiowa-Tanoan language family, which also includes Tewa and Jamez, both of which are spoken in the southwestern United States (Neely 2015, Ethnologue 2016). Kiowa is spoken in Oklahoma, mainly in the southwestern corner of the state. Unlike Mvskoke and Cherokee, which have relatively large speaker populations despite being endangered languages, Kiowa has fewer than 200 speakers, which is less than 1% of their tribal population (Neely 2015). The language is classified as an 8a (Moribund) on the EGIDS, meaning "the only remaining active users of the language are members of the grandparent generation and older" (Ethnologue 2016). Most of this language loss has happened within the past three generations (Neely 2015). Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the Kiowa people migrated south, eventually settling in the southwestern plains of Colorado, western Kansas, Texas, and western Oklahoma. In the late 1800s, the Kiowas were relocated to reservation lands in southwestern Oklahoma, along with the Comanche and Apache people. Like the Mvskoke and Cherokee lands, the Kiowa-Comanche-Apache reservation was eventually allotted and the “extra” land sold to white settlers (Kracht 2009). The Kiowa people now make up the Kiowa Tribe of Oklahoma, with tribal headquarters located in Carnegie, Oklahoma.

Kiowa cosmology, like those of Mvskoke and Cherokee, holds an interconnected view of the world:

> “The collective community had a relationship with sacred power which may best be described as a covenant between the Kiowas and Dom-oye-alm-daw-k’hee, the Great Mystery….The person was spiritually dependent upon the language, folk history, ceremonial ritual, and the sacred tribal relation to nature. No one and nothing existed in isolation” (Boyd 1983, 273).

This conceptualization of all areas of life as intimately interconnected comes from Kiowa oral tradition. In this tradition, the original form of the Kiowa language was understood by both animals and people, which emphasizes both the oneness of all living creatures and the importance of language within this cosmology (Boyd 1981, 5). Besides serving as a connection between living beings, the Kiowa language also plays an important role in ceremonial and sacred ritual through songs. These songs have the power to “stir up spirits” (123), and represent one of the most indexically Kiowa practices of the tribe. Like the Mvskoke example above, Kiowa songs represent a connection to and power over the spiritual world: “during their dances and songs the Kiowas as individuals feel the total tribal power, the tribal spiritual force, merge with the universal power” (5), which is *Dom-oye-alm-daw-k’hee,* or the Great Mystery. In my interview with Kiowa teacher Dane Poolaw, he explained the importance that Kiowas attach to their songs:

> “We always talk about our songs, they're really powerful, you know, at different levels. We have a lot of songs for our tribe to be the size it was back then, and then for the amount of tribes we have here in Oklahoma today we tend to have a lot of songs, like comparatively, if you look at other tribes around here…if you hear Kiowa people we can kinda brag sometimes too, but that's something that we're really proud of.”

The combination of music and language in these songs represents the interconnectedness of Kiowa cosmology and the importance of both elements to accessing and controlling spiritual power. Like both Mvskoke and Cherokee, it is the Kiowa language itself that opens a connection to the spiritual world, because language embodies power.

Kiowa religious cosmology has undergone many shifts throughout their history, as Dane explained to me. After the “original old religion” there was the Sundance, the Ghost Dance, Peyotism, and Christianity, and “some of these things got mixed together.” Despite this history of blending and syncretism, especially between the Ghost Dance and Christianity (Boyd 1981), there is also a strict traditionalism among Kiowas that emphasizes the maxim “things are as they are” (Boyd 1983, 23). Dane also reiterated this:

> “Kiowa people are really strict, you have to say things a certain way, you have to do things a certain way, you gotta conduct yourself a certain way. They say everything's a script for Kiowa…we're expected to know certain things, expected to conduct yourself a certain way…it's almost like an unspoken thing…[in] English, *it is what it is*. I mean, to me that covers it.”

Dane struggled to further explain the idiom “it is what it is,” searching for English words that would exemplify the spirit of the phrase. After some back and forth between us, I understood that he was explaining the strict traditionalism of the Kiowa people by showing me their belief in the inherent nature of tradition. Kiowa people believe traditions are as they are for a reason, making them stricter in regards to change. This traditionalism extends to language use, and “in the minds of some Kiowas especially, Kiowa can never be anything but a spoken language” (Neely and Palmer 2009, 287). The insistence on keeping Kiowa in its original form comes partially from “a secret fear that if someone meddles in something as important as language it might set off things that could turn against us” (287), and also from a belief that the Kiowa language is “natural and real” (288). This language ideology is connected to the ideology of Kiowa holding power in the spiritual world. As a “natural and real” language, Kiowa is inherently connected to the natural and real world, both physical and spiritual, and as such carries power in both contexts.

Kiowa Classes at OU

Dane Poolaw is one of two Kiowa teachers at OU, and has been teaching the language alongside his grandmother Martha Poolaw for nearly ten years. He teaches Kiowa I, II, and III. I had met Dane a few years ago during a language revitalization workshop in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, and remembered being impressed with his enthusiasm for the language and eagerness to learn new pedagogical techniques.

As a second language learner, he remembers having an interest in the language from a young age: “I remember going to some community classes every now and then, I remember the words for numbers and certain words as I was growing up…now I know a lot more than I did back then.” He started seriously studying Kiowa in high school, and continued as an undergraduate student at OU:

> “My Grandma Carol was teaching up here. I was like, *hey, I get to take Kiowa again, I'm going to go ahead and take this class, and my grandma's teaching it,*

> *so I might as well. I better just take it right now.* It was one of the first classes I put down. I know I had required stuff I had to take, but this was taking precedence over it."

Dane is an enthusiastic teacher who is always searching for ways to improve his curriculum and pedagogical methodology by learning from other language teachers. What is most interesting about his level of dedication to the language is that he did not set out to be a teacher at all, instead learning the language for his own culture and heritage. The summer between his junior and senior years of college, he began studying intensely on his own:

> "So that whole summer I was trying to learn Kiowa verbs, I was like, *this is something that I need to figure out how to, how to learn tenses and everything in Kiowa*. So I made these big charts…well it was just me learning something, it was just me kind of obsessing over something. I made these big charts and glossaries, and then I gave it to my grandma, and told her *you can use this for the class.* I was just trying to learn Kiowa. But I guess when I gave that to her, you know, I don't think anybody was ever expecting anything like that."

This ultimately led to him being offered a position as a language instructor at OU when he was only twenty-two years old. Without any training on language teaching, he had to learn as he went, and has made a project of continuing to learn ever since: "I thought I was going to get some training or something, before I started that, because it would be my fourth year in college. And then they said, *No, you start on Monday*."

Like both Kevin and Christine, Dane is committed to teaching his students to communicate in Kiowa. When I asked him what his teaching philosophy was, he replied "to try and get them to speak…to get people comfortable speaking." This is again an emphasis on the communicative function of language, and thus indicative of an ideology of language as referential. He went on to explain his reasoning for focusing on conversational language skills:

> “The way my curriculum goes right now, I'm trying to get them to conversational…when we see each other how do we talk to each other, how to we greet each other, how do we invite each other to eat? You know, just basic communication between each other. Because at home they say…some people [who] are really pessimistic say conversational Kiowa is gone, that's how some people look at it. They can get really pessimistic, which used to make me feel bad, until I realized no, there's a possibility for us to change back and reverse this.”

What struck me about this answer was his immediate attention to language revitalization. Like Kevin, one of his major goals is to contribute to sustained language revitalization, in this case by teaching a domain of language that is not commonly used or well-documented in the archives. This represents a hybrid language ideology, as on the one hand the language being taught is referential, but on the other hand the purpose behind such language is driven by cultural relevance. Since conversational Kiowa is obviously important to Kiowa culture and is taking the brunt of language shift, teaching it in the classroom also represents an indigenous language ideology and a decolonizing practice.

Another important aspect of the way Dane teaches conversational Kiowa is the amount of cultural etiquette he includes in his lessons.

> “I think that respect is the one thing in Kiowa that I'd like them to get pieces of…say for instance some of the language they have is like inviting somebody to eat or offering water…and if you're with a Kiowa person you're going to accept that offer, you don't say no to that. If somebody asks you if you want any water you go ahead and say yes, and then they give it to you, you know, [you] accept it cause they're giving you something. It might just be like a dollar water or something, but that is something that they spent on, it's something they have and they're giving it to you. No matter how small or big it is, you should accept it, as a Kiowa person. It's just the cultural etiquette, and it'd be rude not to.”

Though his focus is on referential communication, the inclusion of cultural practices as an important part of language use represents an indigenous ideology of language as interconnected to all other aspects of culture. Rather than translating common English phrases into Kiowa, Dane teaches referential communication that is directly relevant to Kiowa worldview and practices. I was also curious about other ways he includes culture in the classroom, and he excitedly informed me:

> “Finally I get to put a cultural component in there. Now, I can kinda tie in history, culture, language, now I can make it like a really cohesive class. Now it's going to take a long time, like forty, fifty years. I'm never going to be satisfied with it, but, yeah, I'm really happy with the way it's going.”

The class recently went from a three hour class to a five hour class, giving him “two extra days where...they can go research on culture, and they can present on that.” His inclusion of culture and history in his language curriculum shows an interconnected indigenous language ideology.

Unlike the others, the majority of this interview focused on language ideologies, attitudes, and practices, rather than pedagogical methodology. Since he is a young second language learner of Kiowa, I fully expected Dane’s language ideology to be situated more towards the Euro-American ideology of language as referential, like Kevin’s was. As we talked, however, I was continuously surprised by statements that showed a more indigenous language ideology. Like both Kevin and Christine, his language ideology is complex and hybrid, but there are several ways it points towards a more indigenous conceptualization of language.

One of the reasons I started to notice Dane’s indigenous conceptualization of language was his continued attention to Kiowa speakers, particularly elders who are first language speakers. He called this his “soapbox,” and it was very evident that speaker respect is of upmost importance to him:

> “When you still have speakers there to listen to them. Listen to what they're really saying. If you go into the language then you got a better chance of understanding what they mean when they're telling you something. If somebody

> just goes into the language and they don't know it that well, and they're only hearing surface stuff in English, and they're kinda making their own opinion about it, then sometimes they go off and sometimes there's…Anglifying the languages."

This is again indicative of the indigenous ideology of the interconnection of language and culture, and the hierarchy of respect which places elders at the top. In an endangered language situation, these elders are often the only remaining first language speakers, which often entwines revitalization efforts with a variety of social and political issues, including elder purism. Elder purism happens when older speakers of an endangered language resist the language change brought by younger speakers (Neely 2015). As a young speaker, Dane takes an interesting middle ground in this debate that foregrounds his respect for elder speakers and his desire to listen to their concerns:

> "So when I speak, I want to make sure it's in a way that speakers can understand. And what I teach is, I want to make sure that they do it in a way that a speaker can understand, rather than sometimes you get people that don't understand it as well coming in and saying, *well languages have to change,* kinda forcing the change on the language. Whenever I speak to someone who talks it now, they won't understand what I'm saying if I do it like that. Then I also find that disrespectful to them. That's what I'm trying to do in my classes right now, I'm trying to keep Kiowa, and I'm not going to say in a pure form, that's not what I'm trying to do. I'm trying to do it in an understandable form, something that people who speak it will understand."

This is again indicative of an indigenous ideology of interconnectedness. What is most interesting about Dane's view on this issue is that he does not try to maintain a "pure" form of the language or totally resist change. Rather, he aims for an understandable form that both respects speakers' concerns and allows the language to be a functional tool for the younger generation, indicating a hybrid language ideology. To Dane, language is more than a way to communicate, it is also intimately connected to Kiowa history, culture, and music, making it necessary to respect the position of elders both as speakers and as pillars of the Kiowa community. He went on to note that the younger generation often missed a deep understanding of Kiowa culture because they did not know Kiowa: "[the elders] might be talking to them in English, but they're telling something that's engrained Kiowa way, and sometimes it's engrained in the language itself." In his classes, he strives to teach students how to understand Kiowa in a way that allows them to connect with speakers of the language and better understand Kiowa culture.

> "As I keep learning more and more Kiowa, I'm starting to understand what these older people are meaning. When I didn't know Kiowa, I only got the English side of it, and I took it for what it was and it wasn't the full thing, but now as I watch people who don't understand Kiowa that are Kiowa interact with people that are trying to tell them about Kiowa culture, using English, I can tell that the people who are younger than them don't understand what they're saying. And they don't understand because of the language barrier. There's a disconnect there. I guess it bothered me… that I didn't understand. Now I'm understanding better how the speakers are trying to tell them something, but they're not getting it, and I had to figure out, okay, how do I teach this language in a way that they're going to get, that's going to transfer what they're saying in English? because now maybe they learn Kiowa and it's like *Oh, this is what they mean!*"

This focus on the interconnectedness of culture and language resists the dominant Euro-American ideology of structures of common difference. Even though he knows "that students aren't quite going to understand, coming from so many different backgrounds" when he discusses the importance of Kiowa cultural practices and respect of elders, he includes these things in his classroom because to him, they are inseparable.

The next question I asked concerned language and cognition. I was curious if Dane made a distinction between speaking Kiowa and speaking English, or if he conceived of it more like Christine did, as "just another language." I found that Dane sees significant cognitive differences between English and Kiowa, mainly concerning the bluntness of Kiowa:

> "I always tell people Kiowa is more straightforward, I can be more honest about my feelings, English is really…you can talk around stuff. Now of course there's a culture around it, there's certain things that if I said this in Kiowa the closest thing in English would make me sound a certain way, and they're going to take it wrong, which is one thing I was talking about [with] the older people, when they say something it sounds like they're being bunt, but that's just how Kiowa is. It sounds okay in Kiowa, but when you say it in English it can sounds really blunt. Kiowa people are stern too, I mean they're just naturally stern, even in English they are, it can scare a lot of people away, and it's all part of it's in the language. That's just the way things are."

This shows the important connection between language, cognition, and culture in his language ideology. To him, language is more than a way to communicate, it also encodes specific cultural norms and practices, as well as shaping the way one is "naturally." He gave me some examples of how this expresses itself in his classes, particularly when he tries to get students' attention with a Kiowa phrase that "in English it sounds like you're getting on to someone, in Kiowa people just come to attention because it's the way you get people's attention." Christine demonstrated a portion of this language ideology in saying that there are concepts in English that she has trouble expressing in Cherokee and vice versa, but for Dane this ideology is much stronger.

Our final topic of conversation was the power of Kiowa. As a young second language learner of Kiowa, I expected Dane to conceptualize power similarly to Kevin. I tried to word the question more clearly this time, hoping that it would allow me to address any misunderstandings about what I meant by the word "power," but was surprised when he jumped right into the answer:

> "In Kiowa there's a word *daw*, it's also *is*, existence and everything, but it's also used in a lot of words…and *daw* is just kind of power, in another sense, so when it comes to like stuff like power, you know, it can be anything from something that's real, like an atom I guess (laughs), to having influence on somebody, to something that we can't explain. And then there's still some stuff that's from the unknown, I just let things be, it is what it is sometimes, and if I can't explain it, you know, I can't explain it."

This shows a solidly indigenous conceptualization of the power of language that is similar to the Navajo and Yoeme people. The concept of *daw* as existence, being and generally “it is what it is,” as he later explained to me, is deeply connected to the Kiowa words for to say/saying, song, medicine, and man (people), all of which have *daw* as their base. In this ideology, the Kiowa language is intimately entwined with existence and power, and as such has power in the spiritual and physical worlds. Dane continued to describe how important language is to the concept of *daw*:

> “People always respect the oldest religion we had, and people can be a Peyotist and still respect that religion, people can be a Christian and still respect that religion. But a lot of that, the base of all those religions, there's always that *daw,* that power in there, and a lot of people back at home say about without that language of course, the power diminishes over time. And you know you can kinda see that, the way people conduct our ceremonies in a way, sometimes without the language, it's almost like just going through the motions. It suddenly becomes a little bit less real, and it still has some power left in it, especially with Kiowas and our songs. They'll sing the words to the songs that do have words, and again, they always talk about that power, that our song has a lot of power in it. You can feel it when you're there and when you're out there dancing. When I was a little kid I didn't know how to explain it, I don't know how to explain it today, but any of the Kiowa people out there will tell you you get this, this kind of like a feeling, and kind of like you're nowhere else.”

Without language, the power of Kiowa cosmology diminishes. Even with songs, which are some of the most powerful aspects of Kiowa culture, the words play an important role in bringing that power. While Dane’s language ideology is complex and hybrid, like the other instructors I interviewed, he holds this indigenous ideology quite strongly, as evidenced both by the way he speaks about Kiowa and his classroom techniques.

Conclusion

Each of the three indigenous language instructors I interviewed exemplifies a hybrid language ideology, but the specific components of each ideology are complex and varied. Despite the many similarities among these three languages' precolonial ideologies, the effects of colonial education practices resulted in a multiplicity of language ideologies rather than a direct shift from one to the other. As I discussed in Chapter Two, colonial education in the United States contributed to a fragmentation of indigenous languages, cultures, and language ideologies, but here we see ethnographic evidence that such fragmentation is not uniform. There are trends of a shift towards a more referential language ideology from a more performative one, but there is also nuance to the way language is categorized as either referential or performative. The concept of framing is particularly useful in looking at seemingly referential language as actually having rich cultural knowledge encoded within it. When thinking about endangered language revitalization in the modern neocolonial climate of the United States, it is important to understand the hybridity of indigenous language teacher's ideologies in order to best support revitalization and survivance in the university classroom.

Chapter Four: An Ideological Heteroglossia: Implications for Indigenous Revitalization and Survivance

Heteroglossia is the English translation of a term coined by literary and linguistics scholar Michael Bakhtin (1981) to represent “the juxtaposition of competing voices, each presenting a distinct point of view on the world” (Smith 2004, 251). Though originally used in the context of the juxtaposition of these voices within a written text, particularly the novel, it is also used to refer to the multiplicity of languages within a speech community or other social group. Sometimes these languages are completely different, such as Spanish and English in the southern United States, while at other times they are simply different dialects or speech genres that may exist within a single person rather than a larger social group. The term derives from Bakhtin’s concept of dialogism (1981), which involves the interaction – or dialogue – between competing voices and their eventual reconciliation. This is particularly salient to the concept of heteroglossia. Ivanov (2000) points out this feature, defining the term as “the simultaneous use of different kinds of speech or other signs, the tension between them, and their conflicting relationship within one text.” It is not just the existence of various competing voices that make up a heteroglossia, but the fact that they “may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically,” allowing them to “encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people” (Bakhtin 1981, 292). The dialogic interaction of various disparate voices within a text is what Bakhtin posited as the importance of the novel, where a multiplicity of speakers and perspectives create a space for the negotiation of truth.

When looking at heteroglossia outside of the text, another important aspect is the “internal stratification” it creates within individual people (Bakhtin 1981, 263). Even within a single language there is a multiplicity of domains and interactions, each with a slightly different language. For example, the language used when speaking to a family member or close friend is quite different than the language used in a court of law, a heteroglossia which is even more apparent in multilingual contexts where different languages are used for these different contexts. Additionally, this “internal stratification” has to do with the meaning of words. Bakhtin rejected Saussure’s premise that a word (signifier) has a one-to-one correspondence with a meaning (signified), instead suggesting that “a linguistic expression is considered as a relatively open meaning potential, that is, a multiplicity of multiple meanings” (Lähteenmäki 2004, 91). Even among speakers of the same language meaning is not always clear or fixed, which opens the possibility for “constant interactions among the meanings, all of which have the potential to influence each other” (Iddings, Haught, and Devlin 2005, 36). In this way, heteroglossia functions as an opportunity to negotiate meaning through dialogic interaction.

Heteroglossia is, by nature, strongly connected to the concept of hybridity. To Bakhtin, hybridity is axiomatic to the human condition. One function of heteroglossia is the recognition of variation within speech communities, which assumes a hybridity of various speech within those communities. In my analysis of language ideologies among indigenous language teachers at OU, I use hybridity to refer to the ideological blend that occurs in the clash of various language ideologies, and heteroglossia to refer to the multiplicity of hybrid ideologies that emerge from such a clash. Rather than assume that a singular hybridity from the clash of referential and performative ideologies, I utilize the concept of heteroglossia to examine the multiple and varied ways these ideologies blend in different people.

Heteroglossia has often been extended beyond its original meaning. Because the "juxtaposition of competing voices" is salient in a variety of contexts beyond language use, the theoretical basis of this idea can be applied more widely than its original intention. One particularly interesting extension is the concept of *heterographia*, used by Neely and Palmer (2009) to refer to as "a situation in which one language is approached via multiple writing systems" (272).[5] By studying the multiplicity of Kiowa orthographies and their various developments, they are able to examine the interactions between these juxtaposed orthographies and determine the role of those interactions in negotiating what it means to revitalize the Kiowa language. Here I want to extend the concept to the study of language ideologies, and specifically the ideological shift discussed in Chapter Three. Kickham (2015) also discusses the multiplicity of language ideologies among Choctaw speakers in the context of heteroglossia: "Speakers (here used to include language learners and teachers) may also hold multiple and conflicting ideologies, exhibiting a type of ideological heteroglossia not just in language form, but in language ideology" (153). By conceptualizing conflicting language ideologies as a heteroglossia, one is able to examine the dialogic interactions among those ideologies and examine the new ideologies that are negotiated through that conversation. Language ideologies are inherently multiple within a social group or speech community (Kroskrity and Field 2009), and often within a single person as well (Sallabank 2013).

---

[5] This term is credited to Sean O'Neill from a class discussion in 2005.

Anderson (2009) also highlights the multiplicity of ideologies in his work among the Arapaho, claiming "there is no permanent, closed, 'us versus them' border to contest, no singular Euro-American ideology set against a singular Arapaho language ideology" (53). His focus is on the ideological clash between dominant and minority language ideologies, which is particularly salient in an endangered language context. Whether conceived of as a dialectical clash or a dialogic conversation, the result of such ideological conflict is to open a space for a new ideology to be negotiated in a third space hybridity. As both Anderson and Kickham point out, the ideologies that feed into this third space hybridity are not homogenous or pure. Stockhammer (2012) claims that "hybridity can only exist in opposition to purity; if we speak of hybridity, we must accept the existence of purity" (2), but in fact the ideologies that create this hybridity are multiple and complex. To try and conceive of them as pure is essentialist, leaving out the inherent complexity and of ideological creation and maintenance. While it is important to recognize the multiplicity of ideologies that make up both sides of the dialectic, it is even more important to understand that the hybridity formed is equally heteroglossic. In a traditional dialectic, the thesis and antithesis will combine to form a hybridity that then become the thesis for the next dialectic, and so on. In the study of language ideologies and ideological shift, however, both the thesis and antithesis are multiple and variant, combining to form fractured and heteroglossic hybridities with numerous disparate iterations. In order to understand the ideological shift discussed through the ethnographic examples in Chapter Three, it is necessary to conceive of the hybridity and third space of language ideologies as a heteroglossia, rather than "assuming that homogeneity and stability represent the norm" (Blackledge and Creese 2014, 1).

The language ideologies expressed by the three instructors I interviewed in Chapter Three are representative of such an ideological heteroglossia, being strikingly different while still exhibiting many similar characteristics. Despite each of them being a part of a different language community, their languages' historic ideologies are very similar, which opens the possibility to discuss their modern ideologies as the result of a dialectic and subsequent hybridities. Of course, it would be disingenuous to characterize the historic ideologies as homogenous, regardless of certain definite similarities among them. As discussed above, language ideologies are heteroglossic even among people of a singular speech community, something that holds true for the language ideologies of Mvskoke, Cherokee, and Kiowa. What is of particular interest in this research is the similarity between the historic language ideologies of these three languages and the dialectic colonizing processes that resulted in an ideological hybridity among speakers and learners today. Because language ideologies are so complex and variant, I focus only on those ideologies which point towards the function of language; namely, the distinction between language as performative and language as referential. All three of these languages possess some performative ideology that views language "as a more powerful and creative force that 'makes' the natural and social worlds they inhabit," while a mainstream Euro-American ideology is more referential, emphasizing "the denotational and referential functions of 'words for things," as discussed in Chapter Two (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 10). Because colonization situated the balance of power on the side of Euro-American languages, cultures, and language ideologies, there was some amount of shift from indigenous to Euro-American language ideologies, both voluntary and involuntary. Rather than conceptualize it as a homogenous shift from one to the other, I interpret my interview data to show a dialectic of ideologies that resulted in a heteroglossia of ideological hybridities.

All three of the language instructors I interviewed come from different backgrounds and levels of experience in their languages. Both Kevin and Dane are young second language learners of their respective languages, while Christine is an older first language speaker of Cherokee. Kevin has been actively learning Mvskoke for around fifteen years, and Dane has been learning Kiowa for nearly the same amount of time. Christine learned English as a first grader, and has been speaking Cherokee since birth. Based on the ages and speaker status of these instructors, I assumed Kevin and Dane would have a more similar language ideology, and Christine's would be different. What surprised me was the similarities between Christine and Kevin, while Dane had the most striking differences to the other two. I found all of them to have a hybrid language ideology, leading me to conceptualize the clash of Euro-American and indigenous language ideologies as a dialectic rather than a homogenous shift.

Kevin's language ideology conceptualizes of both Mvskoke and English mainly as referential, shown in the way he focuses his language lessons on everyday words and phrases, though some of these words are more framed to embody cultural knowledge. Because his main goal is the revitalization of Mvskoke, he teaches his students conversational language for a variety of domains, thus allowing them to use Mvskoke in multiple areas of their lives. In this way his class is focused mostly on "words for things" (Kroskrity and Field 2009, 10), and throughout our interview I noticed that he seemed to conceptualize of language this way in general, not just as a language teacher. However, his language ideology also incorporates some aspects of a more historic Mvskoke ideology as seen through previous studies on the language and archival data, including the link of cultural practices to the language. His desire to start an immersion program at OU that includes more cultural practices, specifically “the way you begin and end things,” is indicative of a belief that language and culture are intimately connected. Furthermore, his commitment to language revitalization is also indicative of the ideology that supports language as an important part of cultural practices and being an indigenous person. While his conceptualization of the function of language is situated more towards language as referential than language as performative, it is clear that his language ideology is hybrid and informed by both indigenous and Euro-American conceptualizations of language.

Christine’s language ideology has many similarities to Kevin’s, specifically her main conceptualization of language as referential. Like Kevin, she focuses mainly on conversational Cherokee in her classes, using prewritten dialogues to help students learn how to conduct a simple conversation in the language. The language in these dialogues is everyday language that students can use in their modern, and often nonindigenous, lives. In our interview, she specifically responded “no” when asked if Cherokee has power over the physical world, also indicating a less performative language ideology. However, what is especially interesting about her interview is her acknowledgement that Cherokees “who did not take the Anglo way” do hold a more performative language ideology, though she does not conceptualize of language that way herself. This points to an ideological shift between language as performative and language as referential that occurred among Cherokee speakers, but that shift is not homogenous. As a first language speaker of Cherokee, Christine is an excellent example of the heteroglossia of such an ideological shift. She practices Christianity rather than the stomp dance and conceives of language as more referential than performative, but at the same time spoke only Cherokee for the first six years of her life and continues to place a high importance on the language. In her classroom, she teaches mostly referential language, but also incorporates Cherokee history and culture as inseparable parts of language learning, thus indicating an ideology of interconnectedness. This shows that her own language ideology is a hybridity of indigenous and Euro-American influences, but also that her ideological hybridity is not the only one present among Cherokee people. Some Cherokees practice the stomp dance and conceive of language more performatively, as she mentioned during our interview, while others have different combinations of ideologies. Together, these various combinations of ideologies make up an ideological heteroglossia, showing the diverse nature of colonial effects on language ideologies.

Out of the three instructors I interviewed, Dane holds a language ideology closest to his language's historic ideology, despite his status as a young second language learner. Like both Christine and Kevin, he focuses on teaching conversational language in his classroom, indicating a more referential language ideology. However, throughout our interview it became clear that his overall conceptualization of language is much more performative. He spoke at length about the Kiowa word *daw*, which means existence, power, and being, explaining the power that can be felt through Kiowa songs at the ceremonies. He elaborated that it is the Kiowa language which carries the power of the ceremonies, which points to an ideology of language as performative. Additionally, throughout the interview he kept coming back to the cultural elements of Kiowa, specifically the way certain behaviors and communicative strategies are embodied within the language itself. In his class, he is concerned with teaching students some of these culturally relevant behaviors, such as hospitality and respect for elders. The inseparability of these things in teaching the Kiowa language is indicative of an ideology of interconnectedness, which goes hand in hand with an ideology of language as performative. Dane's language ideology is situated closer to the side of language as performative rather than language as referential, while still encompassing some aspects of other language ideologies. This ideological hybridity is quite different from the ideological hybridity of either Kevin or Christine, and yet still has some similarities. Because Mvskoke, Cherokee, and Kiowa all have similar historic conceptualization of language as performative, the disparity among the language ideologies of these three instructors supports the conceptualization of colonial ideological shift as a heteroglossia of ideological hybridities.

Revitalization, Sovereignty and Survivance

Language revitalization is a primary concern for many indigenous languages in the United States, both for the purpose of saving the language from falling asleep and as an act of sovereignty and self-determination over language use. As discussed in Chapter Two, language ideologies play an important role in endangered revitalization processes. Kroskrity (2010) notes that language ideologies are "bound up not only in the process of heritage language attrition and death but also in the very activities of language renewal and revitalization" (205-6), and Neely and Palmer (2009) discuss the problems that can arise when an outside language ideology is forced on an endangered language community. Much of the literature on indigenous language revitalization focuses on ideologies of language as intimately connected to identity, language as a resource, and language as a human right.

Sallabank (2013) points out the inherent connection between language and identity: “for many members of endangered language communities, links between language, culture, and identity are subjectively real” (79). According to second language acquisition theory, language is the place where self-identity is constructed (Norton 1995), and this creation is not one-dimensional, but rather as “multiple and contradictory” (15) as the social contexts in which a language user can participate. The act of language learning results in learners “constantly organizing and reorganizing a sense of who they are and how they relate to the social world” (18). Rather than a simple creation and appropriation of a new identity, language learning and use becomes a struggle for power between multiple dimensions of self and, if done effectively, a way to enter into a different group identity as well. In this way, language becomes a resource, a form of cultural capital that can be exchanged for acceptance into a group identity. Cultural capital, or the “knowledge and modes of thought that characterize different classes and groups in relation to specific sets of social forms” (Norton 1995, 17), is a theory proposed by Bourdieu and Passeron (1990). They argue that “language is not simply an instrument of communication: it also provides…a more or less complex system of categories, so that the capacity to decipher and manipulate complex structures…depends partly on the complexity of the language transmitted by the family” (73). Language is a form of cultural capital, and the acquisition of it contributes to the power of an individual or a collective society. Linguistic cultural capital must be understood as both the mastery of language, as the ability to manipulate linguistic structures in advanced ways allows an individual to gain power in that society, and also as an individual's relation to that language, as the identity associated with linguistic competence is also a means of gaining power. For Bourdieu and Passeron, these ideas of linguistic cultural capital were linked mainly to social class among people of the same ethnicity (76), as were Marx's theories of capital and power. Combined with the theory of language learning as the creation of a new self-identity, cultural capital becomes both the ability to manipulate linguistic structures in a way that allows an individual to gain power in that language community and also the personal relationship of that individual to the language, as the created self-identity is also a means of gaining power. By learning a second language, "learners who struggle to speak from one identity position can reframe their relationship with their interlocutors and reclaim alternative, more powerful identities from which to speak" (Norton & McKinney 2011, 74).

Giles and Johnson (1987) are some of the first to position identity theory as an approach to language revitalization and maintenance. Hermes and Kawaiʻaeʻa (2014) and May (2013) build on these themes and demonstrate important role of ethnolinguistic identity in language revitalization. Many learners of an endangered language have some kind of connection to that language, making their language learning efforts often either "a personal desire to regain a sense of their indigenous identity and belonging to a community" or "a political act…to assert cultural autonomy or sovereignty" (Hinton 2011, 310). While endangered languages may not have as much cultural capital in the wider world as a global language like English or French, they provide access to identity in cultures that are likely very important to learners. Learning an endangered language allows a learner that has a personal heritage in the language (known as a heritage language learner) to form an identity in that language. Language learners often have “a complex identity and multiple desires” for learning (Norton & McKinney 2011, 75), a fact which is especially true of endangered language learners as they often have an identity in the dominant culture as well that they either wish to escape or keep alongside their heritage identity, depending on the circumstances.

Related to the discussion of language as resource and a marker of identity is that of language as a right. Tove Skutnabb-Kangas (2010), who has written extensively on the subject elsewhere as well, makes the important distinction between assimilation and integration when it comes to minority and endangered languages:

> “*Assimilation* is enforced subtractive ‘learning’ of another (dominant) culture by a (dominant) group. Assimilation means being transferred to another group, *Integration* is characterized by voluntary mutual additive ‘learning’ of other cultures” (214).

Her argument is that speakers of endangered and minority languages have the right to integrative education rather than assimilative, so they can maintain their own language while also gaining the resources of the majority and dominant language. For English, simply having speaking knowledge affords work opportunities and exponential growth of social group interaction, with reading and writing knowledge only expanding that power and prestige. For a small indigenous language, speaking knowledge might afford an individual opportunities to work a select number of specialized positions that require knowledge of the language, with reading and writing (if they are a part of that particular language) would afford some power in academia or perhaps a different type of specialized job, but not much more from a Eurocentric perspective. From an indigenous perspective, however, knowledge of the language opens the door to more traditional knowledge and ways of knowing that might not be fully accessible in English. It provides the speaker with cultural capital in both communities, a foot in both worlds so to speak. This power promotes a healthier self-identity, which in turn promotes a better expression of both self and culture in local and dominant communities. Knowledge of two or more languages and cultures places the individual in a position of higher power, which allows him to better advocate for the increased power of his language and culture as a whole.

These ideologies often assume a more homogenous view of the needs and desires of specific indigenous language communities, but it is important to conceptualize ideologies as heteroglossic and complex, both within a larger group and at the individual level. Especially in neocolonial context where ideologies have been shaped by unequal discourses of power, multiple language ideologies can exist within a single individual. Language is not always important to the community as a main marker of identity (Sallabank 2013; Wyman, McCarty, and Nichols 2013), nor is it always viewed as a resource. Neely (2015) shows that “the power of Native American languages as symbolic tools and badges of identity that encode and embody important cultural information has the potential for both empowerment and disenfranchisement” (74), reminding of the importance of understanding ideological positionings as varied and multiple. Like the ideologies of language as referential or performative discussed above, these ideologies are the products of dialectical clashes between various indigenous and Euro-American ideologies, and as such represent the heteroglossia of ideological production and shift.

This ideological heteroglossia is more than just a product of colonization and subsequent ideological shifts, it is a result of indigenous resistance and survivance. King, Gubele, and Anderson (2015) describe survivance as:

> "survival and resistance together: surviving the documented, centuries-long genocide of American Indian peoples and resisting still the narratives and policies that seek to marginalize and – yes, still now – assimilate indigenous peoples….It can refer to the survival and perpetuation of indigenous communities' own rhetorical practices, it can refer to indigenous individuals' and communities' usage of Euro-American rhetorical practices, and it can refer to all the variations and nuances in between" (7).

Importantly, survivance encompasses both sticking to a historic ideology and ideological shift, as well as any combination in between the two. As a "renunciation of dominance, tragedy, and victimry" (7), this allows for an ideological heteroglossia that supports individual needs. There is a tendency for academics to look at shifts away from the historic ideologies as "a shift away from an authentic past" (Bucholtz 2003, 400; see also Kickham 2015, Fishman 1966, and Hill 2002), but conceptualizing these shifts as products of indigenous survivance and ultimately decolonizing practices allows for a better understanding of current language ideologies and their effects on indigenous language revitalization.

Through my interview data, I saw that indigenous language instructors at OU hold multiple and varied language ideologies. I also noticed that they had different goals and plans when it came to language revitalization work. At the university level especially, classroom language teaching does not equal language revitalization because the majority of students studying an indigenous language at a university are not indigenous, and because it is impossible to teach enough language to create new speakers in only a few semesters. For Kevin and Dane, language revitalization efforts are personally very important to them. They both mentioned revitalization early on in the interview, citing it as a major reason why they teach specific forms of language in their classes. Kevin’s desire to start a Mvskoke immersion program at OU is also a result of his focus on language revitalization. For Christine, however, teaching Cherokee is more about showing students the complex diversity of an indigenous language and teaching them about Cherokee culture and history through language lessons. She mentioned that some students do go on to do language revitalization work, but it is only a few out of the hundreds she has taught in her thirty years at OU, and therefore not her primary goal. It is problematic to assume a shared primary goal of language revitalization among indigenous language instructors, just as it is to assume a homogenous ideological shift between language as performative and language as referential.

Both Kevin and Dane are very committed to language revitalization in their own lives, and one of their main contributions to this revitalization is simply continuing to speak their languages and extended the life of their languages by several more years. Rather than assume that language revitalization is the goal of indigenous language classes at the university level, it is important to examine the other reasons teaching indigenous languages in the university is so important. Regardless of each individual instructors’ personal goals for teaching their language at the university level, the language is being spoken and learned in a university classroom, which is an inherently decolonizing practice. This decolonization of a traditionally Western space is the main reason why creating a third space in the university language classroom is vital. The indigenous language classroom in a university setting is a third space that disrupts a westernized academic system by bringing in alternate languages, cultures, knowledges, and ideologies, which allows for new hybridities to form. Each of these new hybridities represents an example of indigenous survivance, and is therefore a decolonizing hybridity. The heteroglossic shift between ideologies of language as performative and language as referential have "repercussions on how people in the community consider the prospects for language revitalization" (Samuels 2006, 529), but it is not the job of academics to determine these repercussions (Neely and Palmer 2009). Rather, we should look at these shifts as representations of indigenous survivance, and look for ways to support the continued creation of third spaces in the university language classroom.

Conclusion

Bakhtin's heteroglossia merges well with concept of ideological hybridity, showing that the clash of performative and referential language ideologies has resulted in a multiplicity of ideological blends among indigenous language teachers. By looking at these as a heteroglossia of blends rather than a singular ideological shift, it becomes clear that the variety of ideological hybridities present among speakers of indigenous languages is a result of indigenous survivance and resistance to colonialism. Each of the three language teachers that I interviewed for this project have a language ideology that combines aspects of performative and referential ideologies, and each is unique from the other two. Despite many similarities among their languages' precolonial ideologies, the effects of colonialism are complex and varied among different people.

For academics who are also outsiders to indigenous communities, it is easy to look at these hybrid language ideologies on a scale from positive to negative. Because colonial education practices have been a great disrupter of indigenous lifeways and languages, the resulting hybridity that ensues is often conceptualized of as purely negative. It is true that colonialism wreaked havoc on indigenous languages and ways of knowing, and continues to do so today, but what is often missing from the narrative are acts of indigenous resistance and reclamation of the things disrupted by colonialism. In our rush to condemn colonialism, and rightfully so, non-indigenous academics can easily fall into the neocolonial trap of condemning any and all blending of indigenous and Euro-American languages, knowledges, and ideologies in indigenous communities as somehow problematic, especially in the context of language teaching. The issue here is not resisting ideological shift and blending, but rather assuming it is our place to make that judgment, rather than seeing the heteroglossia of ideological blending as an act of indigenous survivance. Among different indigenous language communities and individuals within those communities, there are multiple and varied language goals and ideologies. In the three indigenous language teacher interviews in this work, we see three different ways to teach indigenous languages in the university classroom, and three different ideologies that accompany such work. As I discussed in Chapter Two, the university language classroom provides an opportunity for the reclamation of a traditionally non-indigenous space for indigenous languages, knowledges, and ideologies, and these three teachers each go about reclaiming their classroom space in a different and important way. Rather than positioning their pedagogical methods and the language ideologies those methods stem from as either correct or incorrect, it is vital to recognize this heteroglossia of ideologies as all equally valid in order to support the decolonization of the indigenous language classroom.

References

Acheraïou, Amar. 2011. *Questioning Hybridity, Postcolonialism, and Globalization.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Agbo, Seth. 2004. First Nations Perspectives on Transforming the Status of Culture and Language Schooling. *Journal of American Indian Education,* 43 (1): 1-31.

Austin, John. 1975 [1962]. How to Do Things with Words, Lecture I. In *How to Do Things with Words*: *The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955,* edited by J.O Urmson and Marina Sbisa, 1-11. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination.* Edited by Michael Holquist. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Balter, Allison, and Frank Grossman. 2009. The Effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on Language and Culture Education in Navajo Public Schools. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 48 (3): 19-46.

Barker, Debra K. S. 1997. Kill the Indian, Save the Child: Cultural Genocide and the Boarding School. In *American Indian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Contemporary Issues,* edited by Dane Anthony Morrison, 47-68. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Basso, Keith. 1996. *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Beaulieu, David. 2006. A Survey and Assessment of Culturally Based Education Programs for Native American Students in the United States. *Journal of American Indian Education,* 45 (2): 50-61.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture.* New York: Routledge.

Blackledge, Adrian and Angela Creese. 2014. Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy. In *Heteroglossia as Practice and Pedagogy,* 1-20. Dordrecht: Springer.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice.* Translated by Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre and Jean-Claude Passeron. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture.* Translated by Richard Nice. London: Sage Publications.

Bowles, Freddie. 2012. Teaching Choctaw as a Foreign Language in a Nontraditional Setting: A Challenge with High Expectations and Possibilities. In *Standing*

Together: American Indian Education as Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, edited by Beverly J. Klug, 87-96. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Boyd, Maurice. 1981. *Kiowa Voices: Ceremonial Dance, Ritual, and Song, Volume 1.* Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

—. 1983. *Kiowa Voices: Myths, Legends, and Folktales, Volume 2.* Ft. Worth: Texas Christian University Press.

Bucholtz, Mary. 2003. Sociolinguistic Nostalgia and the Authentication of Identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 7 (2): 398-416.

Calsoyas, Kyril. 2005. Considerations in the Educational Process Relative to Native Americans. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 35 (3): 301-10.

Cantoni, Gina. 1999. Using TPR-Storytelling to develop fluency and literacy in Native American languages. In *Revitalizing Indigenous Languages: Papers Presented at the 5th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Language Symposium*, edited by Jon Reyhner, Gina Cantoni, Robert St. Clair, and Evangeline Parsons Yazzie, 53-58. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University.

Castango, Angelina E., and Bryan M. J. Brayboy. 2008. Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78 (4): 941-93.

Cherokee Nation. 2003. Ga-Du-Gi: *A Vision for Working Together to Revitalize the Cherokee Language.* Tahlequah: Cherokee Nation.

—. 2017. A Brief History of the Trail of Tears. www.cherokee.org/About-The-Nation/History/Trail-of-Tears/A-Brief-History-of-the-Trail-of-Tears.

Cohen, Erik, and Ann Allen. 2012. Toward an Ideal Democracy: The Impact of Standardization Policies on the American Indian/Alaska Native Community and Language Revitalization Efforts. *Educational Policy*, 27 (5): 743-69.

Combs, Mary C., and Sheilah E. Nicholas. 2012. The Effect of Arizona Language Policies on Arizona Indigenous Students. *Language Policy*, 11:101-118.

Conathan, Lisa. 2006. Recovering Sociolinguistic Contest from Early Sources: The Case of Northwestern California. *Anthropological Linguistics,* 18 (3): 209-232.

Deloria, Vine Jr. and Daniel R. Wildcat. 2001. *Power and Place: Indian Education in America.* Golden, CO: Fulcrum Publishing.

Driskill, Quo-li. 2015. Decolonial Skillshares: Indigenous Rhetorics as Radical Practice. In *Survivance, Sovereignty, and Story: Teaching American Indian Rhetorics,* edited by Lisa King, Rose Gubele, and Joyce Rain Anderson, 57-78. Boulder: University Press of Colorado.

Ethnologue. 2016. Cherokee. SIL International. www.ethnologue.com/language/chr

—. 2016. Kiowa. SIL International. www.ethnologue.com/language/kio

—. 2016. Muskogee. SIL International. www.ethnologue.com/language/mus.

Fairclough, Norman. 1989. *Language and Power.* New York: Longman Inc.

Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Assistance to Endangered Languages.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Fordham, Monique. 1998. The Politics of Language and the Survival of Indigenous Culture: From Suppression to Reintroduction in the Formal Classroom. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 31 (1): 40-7.

Garcia, David R. 2008. Mixed Messages: American Indian Achievement Before and Since the Implementation of No Child Left Behind. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 41 (1): 136-54.

Garcia, Ofelia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and María E. Torres-Guzmán. 2006. Weaving Spaces and (De)constructing Ways for Multilingual Schools: The Actual and the Imagined. In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization,* edited by Ofelia Garcia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and María E. Torres- Guzmán, 3-47. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gould, Janice. The Problem of Being 'Indian': One Mixed-Blood's Dilemma. In *Decolonizing the Subject: The Politics of Gener in Women's Autobiography,* edited by Sidone Smith and Julia Watson, 81-97. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hornberger, Nancy. H. 2006. Nichols to NCLB: Local and Global Perspectives on US Language Education Policy. In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization,* edited by Ofelia Garcia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and María E. Torres- Guzmán, 223-237. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Innes, Pamela, Linda Alexander, and Bertha Tilkens. 2004. *Beginning Creek: Mvskoke Emponvkv.* Norman, University of Oklahoma Press.

Ivanov, Vyachelsalv. 2000. Heteroglossia. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 9 (1-2): 100-102.

Kickham, Elizabeth. 2015. *Purism, Prescriptivism, and Privilege: Choctaw Language Ideologies and Their Impact on Teaching and Learning.* PhD dissertation, the University of Oklahoma.

Klug, Beverly J. 2012. Falling from Grace: How the Latest Government Policies Undermine American Indian Education. In *Standing Together: American Indian Education as Culturally Responsive Pedagogy,* edited by Beverly J. Klug, 71-86. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

Kracht, Benjamin. 2009. Kiowa (tribe). *The Encyclopedia of Oklahoma History and Culture*, www.okhistory.org.

Kroskrity, Paul. 2010. Language Ideologies: Evolving Perspectives. In *Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights 7: Society and Language Use*, edited by Jurgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Ostman, and Jef Verschueren, 192-205. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kroskrity, Paul, and Margaret Field. 2009. Revealing Native American Language Ideologies. In *Native American Language Ideologies,* edited by Paul Kroskrity and Margaret Field, 3-30. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Koons, Ryan. Dancing Breath: Ceremonial Performance Practice, Environment, and Personhood in a Muskogee Creek Community. PhD Dissertation, University of California Los Angeles.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. But That’s Just Good Teaching! The Case for Culturally Relevant Pedagogy. *Theory into Practice*, 34 (3): 159-165.

—. 2006. From Achievement Gap to the Education Debt: Understanding Achievement in U.S. Shcools. *Educational Researcher* 35 (7): 3-12.

Lähteenmäki, Mika. 2004. Between Relativism and Absolutism: Towards an Emergentist Definition of Meaning Potential. In *Bakhtinian Perspectives on Language and Culture: Meaning in Language, Art, and New Media,* edited by Finn Bostad, Craig Brandist, Lars Sigfred Evensen, and Hege Charlotte Faber, 89-113. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lee, Tiffany S. 2009. Language, Identity, and Power: Navajo and Pueblo Young Adults’ Perspectives and Experiences with Competing Language Ideologies. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education,* 8:307-20.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. 1963. *Structural Anthropology.* New York: Basic Books.

Levinson, Bradley, and Margret Sutton. 2001. Introduction: Policy as/in Practice – A

Sociocultural Approach to the Study of Educational Policy. In *Policy as Practice: Towards a Comparative Sociocultural Analysis of Educational Policy,* edited by Margret Sutton and Bradley Levinson, 1-22. Westport, CT: Ablex.

Lipka, Jerry, Nancy Sharp, Barbara Adams, and Ferdinand Sharp. 2007. Creating a Third Space for Authentic Biculturalism: Examples from Math in a Cultural Context. *Journal of American Indian Education,* 46 (3): 94-115.

Lipka, Jerry, Nancy Sharp, Betsy Brenner, Evelyn Yanez, and Ferdinand Sharp. 2005. The Relevance of Culturally Based Curriculum and Instruction: The Case of Nancy Sharp.*Journal of American Indian Education*, 44 (3): 31-54.

Lomawama, Tsianina K. and Teresa L. McCarty. 2006. *To Remain an Indian.* Columbia, NY: Teachers College Press.

Loomba, Ania, Kaul Suvir, Matti Bunzl, Antoinette Burton, and Jed Esty. 2005. Beyond What? An Introduction. In *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond,* edited by Ania Loomba, Suvir Kaul, Matti Bunzl, Antoinette Burton, and Jed Esty, 1-38. London: Duke University Press.

Marshall, Kimberly. 2016. *Upward, not Sunwise: Resonant Rupture in Navajo Neo-Pentecostalism.* Lincoln: University of Nevada Press.

McCarty, Teresa L. 2009. Empowering Indigenous Languages – What can be Learned from Native American Experiences? In *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson., Ajit K. Mohanty, and Minati Panda, 125-139. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

—. 2012. Indigenous Languages and Cultures in Native American Student Achievement: Promising Practices and Cautionary Findings. In *Standing Together: American Indian Education as Culturally Responsive Pedagogy,* edited by Beverly J. Klug, 97-119. Plymouth, UK: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

—. 2013. *Language Planning and Policy in Native America: History, Theory, Praxis.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

McCarty, Teresa L. and Sheilah E. Nicholas. 2014. Reclaiming Indigenous Languages: A Reconsideration of the Roles and Responsibilities of Schools. *Review of Research in Education,* 38:106-36.

McCarty, Teresa L., Mary Eunice Romero, and Ofelia Zepeda. 2006. Reimagining Multilingual America: Lessons from Native American Youth. In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization,* edited by Ofelia Garcia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and María E. Torres- Guzmán, 91-110. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Meek, Barbara. 2010. *We Are Our Language: An Ethnography of Language Revitalization in a Northern Athabaskan Community.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Montgomery-Anderson, Brad. 2015. *Cherokee Reference Grammar.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Neely, Amber. 2015. Speaking Kiowa Today: Continuity and Change Through the Generations. PhD Dissertation, The University of Oklahoma.

Neely, Amber and Gus Palmer. 2009. Which Way is the Kiowa Way? Orthography Choices, Ideologies, and Language Renewal. In *Native American Language Ideologies,* edited by Paul Kroskrity and Margaret Field, 271-297. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.

Ngai, Phyllis. 2012. *Crossing Mountains: Native American Language Education in Public Schools.* Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.

Norton Pierce, Bonny. 1995. Social Identity, Investment, and Language Learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 29 (1): 9-31.

Norton, Bonny and Carolyn McKinney. 2011. An Identity Approach to Second Language Acquisition. In *Alternative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition*, edited by Dwight Atkinson, 73-94. New York, NY: Routledge.

Oda, Masaki. 2000. Linguicism in Action: Language and Power in Academic Institutions. In *Rights to Language: Equity, Power, and Education,* edited by Robert Phillipson, 117-21. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

O'Neill, Sean. 2006. Mythic and Poetic Dimensions of Speech in Northwestern California: From Cultural Vocabulary to Linguistic Relativity. *Anthropological Linguistics,* 48 (4): 305-334.

—. 2008. *Cultural Contact and Linguistic Relativity among the Indians of Northwestern California.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

—. 2012. The Politics of Storytelling in Northwestern California: Ideology, Identity, and Maintaining Narrative Distinction in the Face of Cultural Convergence. In *Telling Stories in the Face of Danger: Language Renewal in Native American Communities,* edited by Paul Kroskrity, 60-90. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Panda, Minati and Ajit K. Mohanty. 2009. Language Matters, so does Culture: Beyond the Rhetoric of Culture in Multilingual Education. In *Social Justice through*

Multilingual Education, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson., Ajit K. Mohanty, and Minati Panda, 301-319. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Patrick, Robert. 2008. Perspectives on Change: A Continued Struggle for Academic Success and Cultural Relevancy at an American Indian School in the Midst of No Child Left Behind. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47 (1): 65-81.

Powell, Malea. 2004. Down by the River, or How Susan La Flesche Picotte Can Teach Us about Alliance as a Practice of Survivance. *College Composition and Communication*, 64 (2): 383-406.

Reyhner, John and Jeanne Eder. 2004. *American Indian Education: A History.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Reyhner, Jon, and Denny S. Hurtado. 2008. Reading First, Literacy, and American Indian/Alaska Native Students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47 (1):82-95.

Rizvi, Fazal. 2009. Postcolonialism and Globalization in Education. In *Postcolonial Challenges in Education,* edited by Roland Sintos Coloma, 46-54. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Robbins, Lester. 1977. The Persistence of Traditional Religious Practices among Creek Indians. PhD Dissertation, Southern Methodist University.

Sallabank, Julia. 2013. *Attitudes to Endangered Languages: Identities and Policies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Samuels, David. 2006. Bible Translation and Medicine Man Talk: Missionaries, Indexicality, and the "Language Expert" on the San Carlos Apache Reservation. *Language in Society* 35: 529-557.

Saussure, Ferdinand. 2000. *Course in General Linguistics.* Translated by Roy Harris. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Chicago: Open Court.

Schultz, Jack. 1999. *The Seminole Baptist Churches of Oklahoma: Maintaining a Traditional Community.* Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Shaul, David. 2014. *Linguistic Ideologies of Native American Language Revitalization: Doing the Lost Language Ghost Dance.* New York: Springer.

Shohamy, Elana. 2006. Imagined Multilingual Schools: How Come We Don't Deliver? In *Imagining Multilingual Schools: Languages in Education and Globalization,* edited by Ofelia Garcia, Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, and María E. Torres- Guzmán, 171-83. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Shorter, David Delgado. 2009. *We Will Dance Our Truth: Yaqui History in Yoeme Performances.* Lincoln: University of Nevada Press.

Silverstein, Michael. 1979. Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology. In *Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels*, 193-247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

—. 1981. "The Limits of Awareness." Lecture given to the Harvard Anthropology Seminar, Cambridge and to the Penn Anthropology Colloquium, Philadelphia.

—. 1998. Contemporary transformations of local linguistic communities. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 27: 401–26.

Skutnabb-Kangas, Tove. 2009. Multilingual Education for Global Justice: Issues, Approaches, Opportunities. In *Social Justice through Multilingual Education*, edited by Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, Robert Phillipson., Ajit K. Mohanty, and Minati Panda, 36-62. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

—. 2010. Language Rights. In *Handbook of Pragmatics Highlights 7: Society and Language Use*, edited by Jurgen Jaspers, Jan-Ola Ostman, and Jef Verschueren, 212-233. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Smith, Andrea. 2004. Heteroglossia, 'Common Sense,' and Social Memory. *American Ethnologist* 31 (2): 251-269.

Southard, Naomi. 2004. Muskogees, Methodism and Salt Creek Church: An Ethnohistorical Study. PhD Dissertation, The Graduate Theological Union.

Stein, Wayne J. 1997. American Indian Education. In *American Indian Studies: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Contemporary Issues, edited by Dane Anthony Morrison, 73-92. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.*

Stephenson Mallot, Curry, Lisa Waukau, and Lauren Waukau-Villagomez. 2009. *Teaching Native America Across the Curriculum.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Stockhammer, Philipp. 2012. Questioning Hybridity. In *Conceptualizing Cultural Hybridization: A Transdisciplinary Approach,* edited by Philipp Stockhammer, 1-5. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Sturm, Circe. 2002. *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tehee, Candessa. 2014. Negotiating Acceptance: A Sociocultural Analysis of Second Language Users' Constructions of Speakerhood in Cherokee Nation Language Revitalization. PhD Dissertation, The University of Oklahoma.

Teuton, Christopher, Hastings Shade, Sammy Still, Sequoyah Guess, and Woody Hansen. 2012. *Cherokee Stories of the Turtle Island Liars' Club: Daksi Elohi Anigagoga Junilawisdii (turtle, earth, the liars, meeting place).* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Tylor, Edward. 1924. *Primitive Culture: Researches into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Language, Art, and Custom.* New York: Brentano's Publishers.

Tikly, Leon. 2009. Education and the New Imperialism. In *Postcolonial Challenges in Education,* edited by Roland Sintos Coloma, 23-45. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.

Utley, Robert M. 1964. Introduction to *Battlefield and Classroom: Four Decades with the American Indian, 1867-1904*, Edited by Robert M. Utley, ix-xix. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Voloshinov, Valentin. 1973. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladislav Matejka and I.R. Titunik. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Watanabe, Sandy. 2008. 'Because We Do Not Know Their Way': Standardizing Practices and Peoples through Habitus, the NCLB 'Highly Qualified' Mandate, and PRAXIS I Examinations. *Journal of American Indian Education*, 47 (1): 118-135.

Warhol, Larisa. 2011. Native American Language Education as Policy-in-Practice: An Interpretative Policy Analysis of the Native American Languages Act of 1990/1992. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 14 (3): 279-299.

—. 2012. Legacies of NALA: The Esther Martinez Native American Languages Preservation Act and Implications for Language Revitalization Policy and Practice. *Journal of American Indian Education,* 51 (3): 70-91.

Webster, Joan, Peter Wiles, Marta Civil, and Stacy Clark. 2005. Finding a Good Fit: Using MCC in a 'Third Space.' *Journal of American Indian Education,* 44 (3): 9-30.

Whorf, Benjamin. 1956. *Language Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Edited by John Carroll. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institutes of Technology Press.

Winestead, Teresa, Adrea Lawrence, Edward Brantmeier, and Christopher J. Frey. 2008. Language, Sovereignty, Cultural Contestation, and American Indian Schools: No Child Left Behind and a Navajo Test Case. *Journal of American Indian Education,* 47 (1): 46-64.

Zuckermann, Ghil’ad, and Michael Walsh. 2011. Stop, Revive, Survive: Lessons from the Hebrew Revival Applicable to the Reclamation, Maintenance and Empowerment of Aboriginal Languages and Cultures. *Australian Journal of Linguistics,* 31 (1): 111-27.

Appendix A: Interview Questions

Participants were asked questions about their teaching methodology, classroom practice, and language planning. This set of open-ended questions was modified for each participant, as I asked improvisational follow-up questions to build on our conversation. Some questions were skipped if they did not seem relevant to the conversation at the time.

1) What is your teaching philosophy?
2) What do you hope your students gain from your class, both Native and nonnative students?
3) Can you tell me a little bit about why teaching your language is important to you?
4) Who has most influenced your teaching methodologies?
5) What does your ideal language class look like?
6) What are some ways you include traditional practices or beliefs in your language teaching?
7) What cultural aspects do you try to include in language teaching?
8) If you could create the perfect language classroom, what would it look like?
9) What do you think about immersion style teaching at the university level? Do you try to incorporate immersion practices into your own class?
10) How do you balance indigenous ways of teaching language with the academic standards (assessment, grading, etc) set by OU?

11) Do you often confront conflicting language ideologies in either your language teaching? What are some ways you have dealt with this?

12) What would you like to see in the future of your language program at OU?

13) What have you been taught about the power and purpose of your language, either as a child or through learning your language as an adult?

14) Do you often encounter negative language ideologies on the part of students in your classes? How do you deal with them?

15) Do you believe your language is connected to the physical and spiritual worlds differently than English is? If so, how?